



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 3YTT -

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

585.4

Patrick

יהוה

INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA
ANDOVER FVNDATA MDCCCVII.



cho
-
2,
f

JAMES THE LORD'S BROTHER

cho

2,
+

JAMES THE LORD'S BROTHER

JAMES THE LORD'S BROTHER

BY

WILLIAM PATRICK, D.D.(GLAS.)
PRINCIPAL, MANITOBA COLLEGE, WINNIPEG

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1906

C

Printed by
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.



57,588

TO
MY MOTHER

PREFACE.

THIS book is an attempt to treat the life of James the Lord's brother with the fulness and thoroughness which its importance demands, and thus to make a contribution to the settlement of some of the most difficult problems belonging to the history of the primitive Church. I do not know any work which covers the same ground.

It will be seen that I am convinced of the genuineness of the Epistle of James, and of the trustworthiness of the notices concerning him which occur in the Acts, and that I regard these as substantially the only true sources for his opinions and career. In many of the ablest works on the apostolic age, whether in our own or in other languages, the James delineated is the James of legend and romance rather than the James of history; and hence the James drawn in these pages, who is neither a Nazirite nor an ascetic, will wear an unfamiliar aspect to many. But I can form no conception of a James who is at once the James of the Epistle and the Acts and the James of Hegesippus.

The chapter on the Congress at Jerusalem is that which has cost me most pains. The subject has been

before my mind more or less for thirty years, and I am not aware of any treatise which solves all the difficulties connected with it. Nor do I regard my own account as final. But I have tried to look at the actors in that Assembly as I would look at ecclesiastical statesmen in the same position to-day. It is to me simply inconceivable that men of the capacity and judgment of Peter, James, and John on the one hand, and of Paul and Barnabas on the other, should have failed to frame a measure adapted to the case of the Church of Antioch in which the question of the necessity of circumcision was first raised. Yet many scholars of note, especially on the Continent, assert that the decision of the Congress had no reference whatsoever to the case of the Church of Antioch. Surely it is the duty of any historical criticism worthy of the name to give the leaders of the Christian Church at least some credit for the possession of ordinary foresight and wisdom.

The conclusion reached in these pages, that the Christianity of James was in essence identical with that of Paul, and that the relations between these great leaders were frank and cordial, will hardly be disputed by anyone who duly appreciates the contents of the Epistle. That there were vital differences of conviction between James and Paul, is a dream of the historical imagination. At the same time, each had his own characteristic modes of thought and language, and neither can be measured by the thoughts or language of the other.

It is a pleasure to confess my obligations to the writers who have preceded me in the treatment of one branch or another of my subject. My chief aim has been to understand the authorities and their significance, and so to reconstruct the world of thought and action in which James moved ; and with this end in view I have examined them again and again, and have tested my results by those of others. I have sought help from every available quarter, and have learned much from authors whose view of the apostolic age seems to me defective and misleading, like Weizsäcker, Harnack, Holtzmann, and McGiffert (to name later scholars only), as well as from those whose opinions stand nearer to my own, as Lightfoot, Farrar, Hort, Zahn, Ramsay, and Bartlet. The commentaries of Beyschlag and Mayor have proved of the highest utility. From the nature of the case it is my dissent from, rather than my agreement with, the conclusions of other writers which appears as a rule when names are mentioned. But this dissent must not be regarded as indicating other than the utmost respect for the powers and achievements of many of those whose views I contest. To refer to Lightfoot and Hort only. I am persuaded that Lightfoot has misjudged the evidence of the New Testament and of the earliest Christian tradition on the question of the Lord's brethren, and I cannot follow Hort in believing that James was received into the number of the Twelve, or that his Epistle is later than those of Paul dealing with the question of justification. But I do

not therefore hesitate to say that nowhere will the student of the apostolic and sub-apostolic age find wiser or surer guidance than in the writings of these eminent scholars.

I desire to thank my colleague, Mr. J. S. Will, B.A., for his kindness in reading the proofs and preparing the excellent index.

MANITOBA COLLEGE, WINNIPEG,
January 9, 1906.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
I. JAMES THE BROTHER OF OUR LORD	1
II. JAMES, FROM HIS BIRTH TO THE BEGINNING OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY	22
III. JAMES, FROM THE BEGINNING OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY TO THE RESURRECTION	45
IV. JAMES, FROM THE ASCENSION TO THE CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM	76
V. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES	98
VI. JAMES AND THE CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM	133
VII. THE "CERTAIN WHO CAME FROM JAMES" AT ANTIOCH	188
VIII. JAMES AND THE LAST VISIT OF PAUL TO JERU- SALEM	206
IX. THE LAST DAYS OF JAMES.	222
X. THE ECCLESIASTICAL POSITION OF JAMES	244

APPENDIX.

EXCURSUS I. THE READERS OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES	277
„ II. THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE	288
„ III. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE EPISTLE	295

	PAGE
EXCURSUS IV. THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL RELATIONS OF JAMES AND PAUL . . .	301
„ V. JUSTIFICATION	316
„ VI. WAS THE QUESTION OF THE RELATION OF FAITH AND WORKS FIRST RAISED BY PAUL?	321
„ VII. JAMES ON FAITH AND WORKS	324
„ VIII. ON SPITTA'S VIEW OF THE EPISTLE	337
„ IX. MAYOR'S VIEW OF THE RELATIONS OF FIRST PETER AND JAMES	344
„ X. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE EPISTLE OF JAMES	346
INDEXES	361

JAMES THE LORD'S BROTHER.

CHAPTER I.

JAMES THE BROTHER OF OUR LORD.

THESE pages relate the life of James the brother of our Lord. The phrase "brother of the Lord" is used by St. Paul (Gal 1¹⁹), and was probably the designation by which James was best known. The first question connected with his life is to ascertain the force of this phrase. Is the expression to be accepted in its obvious sense? When James is called the brother of the Lord, is it meant that he was our Lord's full brother? Or, on the other hand, may it only affirm that he was a step-brother or merely a cousin? These three views, to say nothing of various modifications and combinations of them, have commanded wide support throughout the Church, and therefore deserve to be carefully examined.

To an ordinary reader of the Gospels our Lord's brothers seem to be children of Joseph and Mary born after Himself. This is the first impression left by a study of the passages concerned, and it is con-

firmed by every fresh investigation. No other explanation is so natural, so obvious, or so evidently required by the statements of the Gospels.

The language of the Gospels regarding the birth of our Lord suggests and almost requires the conclusion that Mary bore children to Joseph after our Lord's birth. It is stated in Matthew's Gospel (1²⁵) that "Joseph took unto him his wife; and knew her not till she had brought forth a son." This expression implies that Joseph and Mary lived together as husband and wife, and consequently that those who are described as our Lord's brothers were really such. An ordinary reader puts no other interpretation on the passage; and certainly the last idea that would occur to him is that Joseph and Mary lived together as if unmarried. Had the Evangelist intended to say this, why did he use words that convey exactly the opposite impression? A writer wishing merely to affirm that our Lord was supernaturally born (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 263) would have expressed himself very differently. He would have carefully avoided the use of language which plainly implies what on this view he did not believe, and consequently could not have meant to say.

Again, our Lord is described (Lk 2⁷) as Mary's firstborn son. When the Gospel of Luke was written, it was well known whether Mary had other sons or not. The author of the Gospel, had he been aware that our Lord was her only son, could hardly have described Him as firstborn. As the phrase stands, it

JAMES THE BROTHER OF OUR LORD 3

evidently suggests that Mary had other children besides our Lord. It is true that 'firstborn' taken by itself does not imply the birth of other children; but Luke when he wrote knew whether other children were subsequently borne by Mary or not, and, had he believed that she had had no child except our Lord, he would almost certainly have used the unambiguous term 'only begotten,' a term with which he was familiar. It is not satisfactory to say (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 263) that the prominent idea conveyed by the term "firstborn" to a Jew is not the birth of other children, but the special consecration of the first; for a notion of this kind is foreign to a plain historical statement like that of Luke.

Once more, the language of the inhabitants of Nazareth (Mt 13⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶) is almost inexplicable on any other supposition. Here our Lord is described as the carpenter's son. His mother's name is mentioned, His brothers' names are given, His sisters also are referred to. Is it not self-evident that to the citizens of Nazareth Joseph was our Lord's father, Mary His mother, and His brothers and sisters the children of Joseph and Mary?

Such, then, is the direct Scripture evidence implying that children were born to Joseph and Mary. Not a few statements in the Gospels confirm this result. The brethren of our Lord when mentioned in the Gospels are invariably spoken of as such. They are never called by any other name; nor is there anything said regarding them to suggest that they were other

than children of Joseph and Mary. It is noteworthy that they are always described as our Lord's brothers : their relation to Him rather than to Joseph and Mary being emphasized. How can such a usage be explained if they were not His full brothers ? It is inconceivable that, had they been merely kinsmen, they would have been invariably spoken of as brothers ; and, had they been step-brothers, this fact would in some way have been mentioned.

The constant association of the brothers with Mary is fresh confirmation of this view. Why should they always be named along with her if they were not her sons ? Mere kinsmen were not likely to be perpetually with her, and just as little were step-children presumably advanced in years. No explanation of the presence of our Lord's brothers in the company of Mary is so obvious or convincing as that of their being her children.

Then, again, Scripture is completely silent as to any previous marriage of Joseph. It is not unreasonable to conclude that, if Joseph had been a widower with children, some mention of the fact would have occurred. If he was a widower with children, where were his children while he lived in Egypt ? Were they in Nazareth ? Why then did he not go there direct ? The only satisfactory answer to this difficulty is that they were grown up, and possibly had homes of their own. But this view is plainly incompatible with the close relationship between Mary and the brothers described in the Gospels. Had they been as

old or only a little younger than herself, they could not possibly have associated with her as they did. Further, if Joseph had had children before our Lord, would our Lord in this case have been the son of David? Would not the succession to this title have lain rather with the eldest son of Joseph, say James? This argument may not be decisive, but it is certainly not without weight. Moreover, the history of the brothers in the Church is best explained by the view that they were full brothers. Would step-brothers have joined the Church at once and apparently together? Is not such action much more credible in the case of full brothers than of step-brothers, for the brothers, if older than our Lord, had probably long ere this time homes and families of their own.

A calculation as to the age of our Lord's brothers strengthens this conclusion. Paul, writing in, say A.D. 57 (1 Co 9⁵), speaks of our Lord's brothers as occupied with missionary journeys and accompanied by their wives. Is it at all likely that this language could apply to four men born several years before 6-4 B.C.? It is hardly probable that four brothers of such an age should have been alive, and still less probable that they should have been fit for the kind of labour mentioned. But this is to understate the case, at least so far as James is concerned. The first mention of James as the child of Joseph by a former marriage occurs in a work which represents him as grown up at the time of Herod's death (*Protevangel. Jacobi*, 25). A person who was grown up at the death of Herod in

B.C. 4 must have been born at least in B.C. 20. This would make James seventy-seven when First Corinthians was written. Is it at all likely that a man of this age, accompanied by his wife, should have been able to proceed systematically from Church to Church? There is no difficulty, indeed, in believing the fact in itself, because such instances of long life and bodily vigour are recorded. But there is no proof whatever that James lived to an advanced age, and hence in this case ordinary probability must be taken into account.

But against the opinion that our Lord's brothers were full brothers, several objections have been urged. The weightiest of these is the circumstance that our Lord when on the Cross entrusted His mother to the care of John. How, it is asked, could He have done so had Mary had sons of her own? The common reply, that our Lord acted as He did because of the unbelief of His brothers, is scarcely satisfactory. Not only was their unbelief soon to be changed into belief, but even their unbelief need not have disqualified them for discharging the primary duty of sons towards a mother. The truth is, that we are wholly ignorant of what led our Lord to entrust His mother to John, and we can only offer conjectures on the subject. These conjectures do not fall to be discussed here;¹ but, even though they were inadequate and unsatisfactory, the force of the arguments already produced is not thereby lessened. Besides, it should never be forgotten that the difficulty under discussion is hardly

¹ Cp. p. 65 and foll.

more dangerous to the view that our Lord's brothers were the children of Joseph and Mary, than to the view that they were the sons of Joseph by a previous marriage. At most, in the latter case, it is only slightly less; for the step-brothers immediately believed, and the eldest of them rose to a position of commanding importance in Jerusalem. Why in this case did our Lord pass over His step-brothers, especially James, and commend His mother to John? The reason which weighed with Him in passing them over if they were step-brothers might have equally weighed with Him had they been full brothers.

Again, it is argued that the behaviour of our Lord's brothers recorded in the Gospels suggests that they were older rather than younger than Himself. Here confident assertions on the one side are met with equally confident assertions on the other. Conclusions drawn from matter so debatable are in the highest degree uncertain. It cannot be shown that what is related of the conduct of our Lord's brothers is not perfectly consistent with their having been born after Him. Their conviction that His mind had lost its balance, their purpose to put Him under restraint for a time, their unbelief in His claims, are quite compatible with their having been His younger brethren.

The unbelief of our Lord's brethren has also been alleged as a strong argument against the view that they were His full brothers. Their rejection of His claims is said to be more comprehensible if they were older than He. As His seniors, they might feel a

natural jealousy of His pretensions, and His attitude towards the current religion of His time and towards the leaders of the people might seem to them presumptuous and even arrogant. But is there not a jealousy of youthful as well as of riper years? Is there a greater intrinsic probability that older rather than younger brethren should have rejected the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah? Is it not as easy to produce cogent reasons for the action of the brothers on the supposition that they were younger as on the supposition that they were older? This argument then, like the last, is even on the most favourable view hardly of a feather's weight; both of them together might conceivably turn the scale if the opposing considerations were equal; but, as matters stand, they cease to have any value.

The passages in the Gospels which speak of our Lord's birth, or which set forth the relations between His brothers and Joseph, Mary, and Himself, suggest, without exception, that the brothers were children of Joseph and Mary. No sentence can be quoted implying any other view. Nor can any convincing argument be brought against it; for that derived from the committal of Mary to John is, as has been shown, hardly less destructive of the step-brother than of the full brother hypothesis. The truth, however, is that it is destructive of neither. This testimony of the language and facts of Scripture is confirmed by the testimony of history. Not only has the view that the brothers were full brothers the sanction of the most

obvious meaning of the Gospels and of the most natural interpretation of the facts which they relate, it has, further, the support of the earliest trustworthy historical evidence.

It must at once be granted that if this question were to be decided by an appeal to tradition, and if by tradition was to be understood the opinion held in the third and fourth centuries, then tradition affirms that they were His step-brothers. Clement, Origen, Eusebius, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrosiaster, Gregory of Nyssa, and Epiphanius all held this view. But these writers had no opportunity of consulting trustworthy authorities; their statements show that they had none, and hence do not constitute historical evidence. Their opinions are of no more value than those of men to-day regarding the relationships of William of Orange or of Chatham. The only primary authorities are the *Protevangelium of James*, the *Gospel of Peter*, Hegesippus, and Tertullian. The *Protevangelium* represents Joseph as an old man when Mary was married to him, and with sons of his own of whom James was the oldest. The *Gospel according to Peter* describes our Lord's brothers as sons of Joseph by a former marriage (Origen on Mt 13⁵⁵). Whether the testimony of these two writings is independent or not cannot be decided. In the present state of opinion as to their date, it is impossible to determine which is prior to the other, and whether the one makes use of the other. Hence the wisest course is to regard both documents as bearing witness to an opinion

current in the middle of the second century. But is there any reason for believing that this opinion rested on a historical basis? The writings themselves in which it appears are apocryphal. Both of them are fabrications for a purpose. Not a single assertion they contain can be accepted without confirmation from other sources, for many of their notices are plainly at variance with facts stated in the Gospels. Accordingly, no reliance can be put on the accounts given in them of the relationship of our Lord's brothers to Him; that relationship may have been purely imaginary and devised in a dogmatic interest. At any rate the statements in these writings cannot be regarded as embodying a tradition of the slightest historical value.

The testimony of Hegesippus indicates plainly that James was our Lord's brother; but whether he regarded him as a full brother or not is uncertain. He speaks (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 20) of Jude "as said to be our Lord's brother according to the flesh." This expression has been regarded (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 269) as more favourable to the step-brother than to the full brother theory. But it can be quite as naturally understood of the one as of the other. The point emphasized is not that the brothers were Joseph's and not Mary's children, but that they were children of Joseph and Mary, and hence not strictly and truly His brothers. It has been asserted (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 269) that the fact that both Eusebius and Epiphanius, who derived their information mainly from Hegesippus, adopted the view that our Lord's

brothers were His step-brothers, strengthens the position that this was also the view of Hegesippus. The testimony of Epiphanius is much less trustworthy than that of Eusebius, and it will be sufficient for our purpose to examine the language of the latter Father on the subject. His language is as follows (Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 1): "This James was called the brother of the Lord because he was known as the son of Joseph; and Joseph was supposed to be the father of Christ because the Virgin being betrothed to him was found with child by the Holy Ghost before they came together, as the account of the Holy Gospels shows." The exact force of this sentence is not clear. To some it appears that Eusebius would not have spoken of James as being known as the son of Joseph had he not regarded him as a son by a previous marriage. Others, however, hold that what he wishes to point out is simply the difference between our Lord as born supernaturally and James as born naturally. The same uncertainty attends the interpretation of the expressions—"James who was one of the so-called brothers of the Saviour" (Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 12); "James the first bishop there, the one who is called the brother of the Lord" (iii. 7). If the authorship of the treatise on the Star, ascribed to Eusebius, were certain, there could be no doubt as to his view, for mention is there made of the five sons of Hannah (Anna), the first wife of Joseph. It is quite possible that Eusebius held the opinion that our Lord's brothers were not full but step-brothers, and he

may have so understood the language of Hegesippus ; but even though he did, it would not follow that he interpreted Hegesippus correctly. He may have construed the ambiguous phrase 'so called' in accordance with the prevailing opinion of his time. The phrase might have borne one meaning to Hegesippus and another to him. Further, even though it could be shown that Hegesippus himself believed that our Lord's brothers were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage, his testimony would not show that such was the belief of the Church at large, for he might have accepted this opinion directly or indirectly from the *Protevangelium of James* or from the *Gospel of Peter*.

The testimony of the *Protevangelium* and of the *Gospel of Peter* must be set aside because of the character of the documents from which it comes. The view of Hegesippus is uncertain. It is otherwise with the opinion of Tertullian. He nowhere asserts categorically that our Lord's brothers were the children of Mary, but this inference may and should be drawn from certain expressions in his writings. The language which he uses when arguing against Marcion (iv. 19), and against Marcion's follower Apelles (*de Car. Chr.* 7), plainly implies that to him the brothers of our Lord were His brothers in precisely the same sense in which Mary was His mother. He writes, too (*de Monog.* 8, and *de Virg. Vel.* 6), in a manner which shows that he took for granted that Joseph and Mary lived together after our Lord's birth as married persons. That this inference as to the view

of Tertullian is correct, appears from the positive assertion of Helvidius, an assertion that even Jerome does not call in question (*adv. Helvid.* 17). But Tertullian may be regarded as giving not his own opinion merely, but that generally entertained. Had the view that the brethren of our Lord were the sons of Joseph by a deceased wife been known or accepted by him, he could not possibly have written as he does. From the manner in which he expresses himself, it is probable that he was acquainted with no opinion except that which he himself held. If this inference be correct, the Church generally in the age of Tertullian, that is, towards the end of the second century, believed that our Lord's brothers were the children of Joseph and Mary. Certainly Tertullian was of all men of his time the least likely to entertain this opinion unless he had regarded it as the only legitimate inference from Scripture, or had found it current within the Church. The assertion may therefore be regarded as established, that the most ancient trustworthy evidence is in favour of the opinion that our Lord's brothers were the sons of Joseph and Mary.

The only theory that is entitled to be seriously considered along with that just discussed and affirmed, is the hypothesis that our Lord's brothers were step-brothers, the children of Joseph by a former wife. But the arguments against this opinion are decisive. Why is not even the slightest hint given that Joseph was previously married? Why are the brothers not spoken of as step-brothers even on a single occasion?

The step-brother hypothesis affords an altogether inadequate explanation of the language of Matthew and Luke already discussed, and indeed of all the statements bearing upon our Lord's brothers and their relations to our Lord. It cannot for one moment be compared with the hypothesis that they were full brothers, for the natural and straightforward sense which it attaches to the statements of Scripture. Notwithstanding, it has often been argued that it deserves to be preferred to any other because it has the sanction of tradition, and on this ground has been strongly supported by many writers. This claim, however, has just been examined and shown to be baseless. The verdict of history is not for, but against the hypothesis that our Lord's brothers were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage. If any opinion existed in the first two centuries among Catholic Christians, it was the view that our Lord's brothers were uterine and not step-brothers. Moreover, it is, to say the least, highly probable that the view that our Lord's brothers were not the sons of Joseph and Mary can be traced to the sentiment prevailing in the third and fourth centuries as to the superiority of the celibate to the wedded life. Origen affirms distinctly that the brothers of our Lord were the sons of Joseph by a deceased wife (on Jn 2¹², Mt 13⁵⁶). But it is plain from his statement that the authorities on which he relied were the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter* and the equally apocryphal *Protevan-gelium of James*, and that he was influenced in his

opinion by a desire to preserve the honour of Mary. Mary, he thought, should be "the first fruit of virginity among women, as her son was the first fruit of purity and chastity among men." The same considerations that influenced Origen doubtless influenced succeeding writers. If we had full knowledge of their modes of thought, we should probably discover that not Scripture nor history, but a dogmatic conception lay at the root of their view that our Lord's brothers were His step-brothers. It is reasonable to conclude also that the views of Clement of Alexandria, which, as we know from the translation of the *Hypotyposes* by Cassiodorus were the same as those of Origen, were derived from the same apocryphal sources and accepted from the same motives.¹ Perhaps the most conclusive argument against the historical basis of the step-brother hypothesis is the contempt with which Jerome speaks of it (on Mt 12⁴⁶). He would never have ventured to characterise it as he does had he believed it to rest on any other foundation than the "ravings of apocryphal writings."

Another argument, however, in favour of the step-brother theory is its alleged harmony with general Christian sentiment. It is said to commend itself at once to every Christian by its obvious propriety. Now it cannot be denied that the sentiment that Mary

¹ Clement has been quoted on behalf of all three views (Herzog,³ *Clement*, McGiffert, *Euseb.* 104, Lightfoot, *Gal.* 271); but as his opinion is a matter of inference, it is not expedient to attach weight to any particular conclusion.

must have remained a virgin has been widely accepted in all ages and by all Churches. Her perpetual virginity is a dogma in the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches ; but the tenet is not peculiar to these. It is affirmed in some Protestant symbols (*Art. Smalk. 1. 4, Form. Concord., Helvetic Con.*), and has been maintained by many writers whose Protestantism and orthodoxy are above suspicion. That this sentiment was exceedingly active in the early ages of the Church is unquestionable ; but co-operating with it, and perhaps even preceding and causing it, was a false estimate of the married life. Marriage, if not regarded as in itself impure, was yet esteemed a lower condition when compared with virginity. The ascetic view, which exalted the unwedded above the wedded life, was current in the first century ; and St. Paul has even occasion to denounce those who actually forbade marriage (1 Ti 4^s). This mode of thought soon acquired wide influence in the Church. Abstinence from marriage became the duty of all who aspired to live the highest type of life. The mother of our Lord came to be regarded as the ideal of woman, and so it was necessary to believe that she bore no child after our Lord, and was emphatically the ideal of the virgin life.

The worth of the sentiment that there was a moral fitness that Mary should bear no other children will be differently estimated to the end of time. To some its weight will appear considerable, to others trifling ; but it certainly cannot be described as based on any Christian principle, or as in the true sense of the term

universal. If it has prevailed extensively, so, too, has the opposite view. But sentiment is no evidence as to facts. The assertion that Mary cannot have had other children than our Lord, because there would have been a moral unseemliness in her having them, is an argument which carries no logical or demonstrative force, and, viewed in itself and more particularly in the light of Jewish sentiment on the subject of marriage and of Christian sentiment as to the most suitable home life for our Lord, is open to the gravest objections. Marriage was regarded by the Jews as a duty, and children as a special proof of the divine favour. What likelihood is there that this view was not held by Joseph and Mary? Hardly anything short of a command from God could have induced them to think otherwise, and where is the evidence that any such injunction was laid upon them? Further, would not our Lord have been deprived of some of the most valuable lessons of life had He been an only child? Our Lord was evidently intended to share largely in the common lot of man. Was it not, therefore, of consequence for Him to know what it is to have brothers and sisters? Obviously, therefore, the alleged weighty if not conclusive argument drawn from Christian sentiment can be opposed by other arguments still more conclusive.

The theory propounded by Jerome is that the Lord's brothers were His cousins. This view he sought to establish as follows. James the Lord's brother was an Apostle, as is plain from Gal 1¹⁹. But he lived

18 JAMES THE LORD'S BROTHER

long after the death of the son of Zebedee, the only other James among the Apostles; and hence he must be identical with James the son of Alphæus. This James the son of Alphæus was also known as James the less (Mk 15⁴⁰) as contrasted with the son of Zebedee, James the greater. James the less, the son of Alphæus, had a brother Joses. The mother of James and Joses bore the name of Mary (Mt 27⁵⁶, Mk 15⁴⁰), and she was among the women who witnessed our Lord's crucifixion. This Mary, then, was the wife of Alphæus, the father of James and Joses. But our Lord had two brothers (Mk 6³) named James and Joses. And from John (19²⁵) it is clear that among the women at the Cross was Mary a sister of the Virgin. Now, as Mary the mother of James and Joses is stated to have been at the Cross, the identity of this Mary with the sister of the Virgin is evident, and our Lord's brothers are consequently His cousins. This is the theory as advanced by Jerome himself: later scholars enlarged and made it more systematic; but with these additions it is unnecessary to deal.

The theory has no historical basis. Its author does not quote any previous scholars by whom it was held, and he would unquestionably have done so had this been in his power. It is consequently a mere hypothesis, the value of which is to be estimated by its explanation of the facts of Scripture. But its value in this connection is seriously lessened by two considerations. It is a theory avowedly devised in the interests of Mary's perpetual virginity; Jerome

takes credit to himself for advancing a view which affirms not only the virginity of Mary, but that of Joseph as well. It cannot be doubted that Jerome sought in Scripture a support for his theory rather than discovered his theory in Scripture. Further, Jerome himself does not adhere to his own view. His treatise against Helvidius, in which he states and expounds his opinion that our Lord's brothers were His cousins, was written probably about 383. But in his epistle to Hedibia, which is assigned to the years 406-407, he distinguished Mary of Cleophas from Mary the mother of James and Joses, although the identity of these women is one of the foundations of his own theory. He adds, however, that some contend that the mother of James and Joses was our Lord's aunt.

Moreover, most of the propositions that constitute Jerome's theory are questionable, and none of them indisputable. That James is called an Apostle by Paul is highly probable, though the fact has been debated. But it does not follow that he was one of the Twelve, for Paul uses the word 'Apostle' in a sense applicable to others besides the Twelve. The identification of James the son of Alphæus with James the little, the son of Mary, is precarious; and the assertion by which it is accompanied, that James the less is distinguished from James the greater, is inaccurate. For the epithet 'less' applies probably to stature, and no contrast is drawn between him and any other James. That the Mary of Cleophas mentioned in John is the same as Mary the mother of James and

Joses in Matthew and Mark, is possible and even probable. But the last and most important identification, that of Mary of Cleophas with the sister of the Virgin, which is the keystone of the theory, is in the highest degree unlikely. It takes for granted that there were two sisters of the same name, Mary, a case as unusual in an ordinary family in Judæa in our Lord's time as it would be in an ordinary family among ourselves to-day. Yet, again, Jerome assumes that in Jn 19²⁵ only three women are mentioned. But, according to the most tenable construction, four women and not three are referred to by John. On this view of the verse the sister of our Lord's mother is quite distinct from Mary the wife of Cleophas, and the entire theory based upon this identification collapses.

But objections still more decisive remain. The hypothesis is altogether opposed to the distinction clearly drawn in the Gospels and Acts between our Lord's brothers on the one hand and the twelve Apostles on the other. This distinction renders it out of the question that two at least of our Lord's brothers should have been among the Apostles. It is equally refuted by the unbelief of our Lord's brothers in His claims, to which express witness is borne in the Gospels (Jn 7¹⁵). How could our Lord's brothers have been thus described had two of them at least been among the Twelve? Further, how comes it to pass that these brethren appear in the Gospels with Mary their aunt and not with Mary their mother? Does not this show plainly that their alleged mother was not their real mother?

Moreover, the theory of Jerome is utterly inconsistent with the proper sense of the term 'brothers.' If our Lord's brothers were His cousins, why are they not called so? The word 'cousin' is as common in Greek (*ἀνεψιός*) as in English. Why is this term never used to designate the actual relationship on this theory between our Lord and His so-called brothers? No instance can be drawn from the New Testament and none from classical Greek to prove that the term 'brother' ever includes cousin. Three cases are quoted from the Old Testament (Gn 14¹⁴, Lv 10⁴, 1 Ch 23^{21, 22}; Mayor, *Epistle of James*, 10) where cousins are designated by the term 'brothers,' and in two of these cases the Hebrew term (אָבִי) for 'brother' is represented by the Greek term (ἀδελφός) for 'brother.' But no stress can obviously be laid on isolated examples of this kind; least of all can they be held to indicate an established usage. The common assertion as to the laxity with which the word 'brother' is used in Hebrew is inaccurate, as a glance at any good Hebrew lexicon will show. Nothing is more certain than that the word 'brother' in N.T. times had as clear and definite a sense as it has in English to-day. Finally, the earliest Patristic evidence available is opposed to Jerome's view of the identity of our Lord's brothers with His cousins; for Hegesippus employs the term 'brother' to designate James and Jude, while he reserves the term 'cousin' to designate Symeon, James's father's brother's son, who succeeded him in the bishopric of Jerusalem.

CHAPTER II.

JAMES FROM HIS BIRTH TO THE BEGINNING OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY.

JAMES, then, was the brother of our Lord in the ordinary sense of that term, being a son of Mary His mother. Two lists of our Lord's brothers are given in the Gospels (Mt 13⁵⁵, Mk 6³). According to these, their names were James, Joseph or Joses, Simon, and Judas. The order in which the names are given is probably that of seniority, as this is the principle of arrangement commonly adopted in such cases. On this supposition James would be the eldest son of Joseph and Mary. Whether James, besides being the eldest son, was the eldest child, is altogether uncertain. He had sisters as well as brothers, and one or more of the sisters may have been born before him. No inference as to the respective ages of the sons and daughters can be drawn from the fact that the daughters are not mentioned as accompanying their mother to Capernaum (Jn 2¹²), that they do not appear like the sons in her company, and that the citizens of Nazareth speak of them as residing in their midst. The daughters seem to have had homes of their own in

Nazareth, but this circumstance throws no light on the question whether any of them were born before James or not.

Among the Jews of our Lord's time the ties between parents and children were of the closest and tenderest kind. Their duties were reciprocal. If a child was bound to honour and obey its parents, the parents in turn were not less bound to pay the utmost attention to the welfare, moral and physical, of the child. Nowhere through the world was there such noble and attractive family life as among the Jews.

If the sense of parental responsibility was strongly felt by all Jews, it would be especially felt by the father and mother of James, because of their high character and their relation to our Lord. Accordingly, it cannot be doubted that James, together with his brothers and sisters, was brought up in an atmosphere charged with reverence for God and love for man, with tenderness, freedom, and joy. The supreme aim of Jewish parents was to instil into their children from their earliest years the knowledge and observance of the Law. In a home like that of Joseph and Mary, the Law meant not merely rites and ceremonies, but especially the fear of God and the practice of virtue. The earliest lessons received by James from the lips of his father or of his mother were doubtless those of piety. The first truth implanted in his mind would be belief in God as the one Father and Creator of the world. The existence of the one God in whom all Jews believed, the only God, the God who had

entered into covenant with the nation, whose Law they held in unlimited reverence, and whose name and character were their glory, was inculcated on the mind of James before any of the written or unwritten laws with which he would afterwards become familiar (cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 16). Thereafter he would commit to memory the *Shema*, the fundamental confession of faith in God (Dt 6⁴ 7. 11. 13. 21, Nu 15³⁷⁻⁴¹), possibly some child's prayer, and some of the Psalms. Before he could read he would hear from his mother the tales of Joseph, and Samson, and David, and the other national heroes. It is possible that the usages which were binding at a later time already prevailed in the age of James, and that boys were then required to repeat the common prayer and to pray at table (*Berachoth* iii. 3). The worship of the home and of the synagogue and the recurrence of the different annual festivals would contribute largely to the moral education of James. His curiosity would be aroused by the phylacteries or prayer straps worn by his father on his left arm and on his forehead at morning prayer on ordinary days, and by the tassels or fringes of blue or white wool which he wore at the four corners of his upper garment (*Zizith*). The *Mezuza* or box fixed upon the right-hand doorpost, containing in twenty-two lines the two paragraphs Dt 6⁴ 9. 11. 13. 21, touched reverently by every visitor as he entered, and which he was doubtless himself taught to touch, must have stimulated his mind and imagination. He would

have much to ask regarding the steps taken by his father and mother in connection with the observance of the Sabbath and the different sacred days. From his earliest hours of consciousness he would be taught, alike by the speech and example of his parents, reverence for God and for the Law, together with lessons of truthfulness, simplicity, mercy, and beneficence.

But, though the education of every Jew consisted almost exclusively in religion, and therefore bore chiefly on conduct, the intellectual element was not absent. The fact that duty was embodied in sacred books was an intellectual stimulus, and caused reading and writing to be largely cultivated. The ability to read the Law was eagerly sought, and hence reading and even writing were widely diffused among the common people. James may have been taught to read and write by his parents or by travelling teachers. But, judging from the size of Nazareth, it probably had a school to which he would be sent. The age at which attendance at school began is differently stated by different authorities, some making it five and others six; the latter view is that which is found in the Talmud, and probably represents the general custom. The teacher of the school has hitherto been commonly identified with the clerk or officer of the synagogue (*Hazzan*); but this view has lately been disputed (art. 'Education' in *Hastings' DB*, vol. i. p. 650). Considering the high estimation in which the teacher was held by the Jews, it does

seem improbable that duties so important as his should be combined with the charge of the rolls of the Synagogue and with the whipping of criminals. It must not therefore be taken for granted without further inquiry that the officer of the Synagogue was at the same time the teacher of the school, for it is quite possible that these were distinct occupations. The teacher of the school may have belonged to those doctors of the law spoken of by Luke (5¹⁷). These were found, according to him, in every village of Galilee and Judæa. The suggestion that the teachers of schools were found in this class has much to recommend it.

The subject of instruction was the Law. During the earlier years of school life, Scripture was the only text-book. The custom in later times was to begin with the Pentateuch and then to proceed to the Prophets and finally to the Hagiographa. The first book to be read was Leviticus, as it was the chief source of knowledge regarding the Law. It is quite possible that the education of James followed some such course as this.

To determine the language in which this education was given should, to all appearance, be the easiest of tasks; yet upon no question is there greater uncertainty. It is stated nearly everywhere that this instruction was given in Hebrew, for Hebrew only was allowed in school. It is, however, difficult to frame a conception of the manner in which boys who spoke Aramaic at home could be taught to read and

write in what was to them a foreign tongue. Was a boy in Nazareth set to read Hebrew and not Aramaic? Did he learn to read it without understanding it? If he could read and understand it, what necessity was there that the lessons read in the Synagogue should be translated into the vernacular? Was this done merely for the sake of the women? Again, is it in the least probable that village boys would be taught to write in a language which they could not speak, and which was at this time, so far as spoken, a tongue confined to the learned?

These difficulties are so grave as to throw much doubt on the assertion that the Hebrew Bible was the text-book from which boys were taught to read and write. It is hardly possible to conceive how boys belonging to the common people could have been taught these arts in other than their native Aramaic. Whether the teachers themselves were acquainted with Hebrew must remain an open question, although it is probable they were; but that they employed any other tongue except Aramaic in teaching reading and writing, is scarcely credible. If, then, instruction was given in Aramaic, there must have been in existence translations of at least certain portions of the O.T. into Aramaic adapted for use in schools, if not a complete translation. The only alternative supposition is that every teacher knew Hebrew, and translated certain passages of that language into Aramaic for the benefit of his pupils. But this latter view is so improbable

that it may be concluded that a child's Bible if not a people's Bible in Aramaic existed in the time of our Lord. This child's Bible would be the text-book from which James was taught to read and write.

What special form of Aramaic James was taught cannot be ascertained. It is doubtful whether any existing works contain the idiom spoken in Palestine during the first century. The best scholars hold that there were several dialects of Aramaic, and that at least three varieties of it were to be found: one in Judæa, a second in Samaria, and a third in Galilee. The first of these was probably the language of literature, and the speech of educated persons throughout the land. It is barely possible that this was the dialect that James acquired, but it is much more probable that he was taught the dialect which was current in Galilee, and which in the latter half of the second century became the common speech of the whole land (Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 14).

What James learnt at school, besides Scripture, or, indeed, whether he learnt anything else, and how long he remained there, is altogether uncertain. No evidence exists to show whether the children of the working class ever entered upon the study of what, when reduced to writing, became the Mishna. The rule often quoted, that this study should be taken after the tenth year, is long posterior to the time of James, and is perhaps quite inapplicable to Jewish schools in the first century. It is barely possible that as the Mishna was in a sense more highly valued

than the Old Testament itself in our Lord's time, the teachers who were acquainted with it would naturally introduce their most promising scholars to its contents. Attendance at school by the children of the common people would hardly cease as early as ten, and accordingly a number of the brighter children may have acquired at school some elementary knowledge of the Oral Law. It is conceivable that James gained some acquaintance with this Law at school; but if he did, that acquaintance was so slight as not to entitle him to be regarded as familiar with the Law. His education was in no sense different from that of the Jewish children of the working classes. Of higher instruction in the technical Jewish sense he had none.

What opportunity, if any, of learning Hebrew, the language of the sacred books, was open to boys in the position of James, cannot be ascertained. It would be rash to take for granted that the ordinary schoolboy was taught any language except Aramaic. At the same time, the connection between Aramaic and Hebrew was so close and the enthusiasm for the study of the Law so great, that not a few boys may have acquired the ability to read Hebrew even at the common school. That our Lord possessed this ability is generally admitted. It is not to be supposed that He enjoyed greater advantages than James, and hence James, too, may have been able to read the Old Testament in Hebrew. It is hardly credible that Joseph possessed either the whole of

the O.T. in Hebrew or even a single book of it. But he may have been able to purchase the sections used for the education of children. Or both our Lord and James may have obtained access to the rolls preserved in the Synagogue, which were the property of the community, and may thus have read the O.T. in Hebrew. (Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i. 234, thinks that a complete copy of the Old Testament was possessed by our Lord's family.)

James then learned to read and write Aramaic at school; possibly, too, he may have been taught some Hebrew. That he studied Greek at school, and was thus able to read the LXX, is much less probable. Of the wide diffusion of Greek in Galilee during the first century there is ample evidence. The administration of affairs throughout Galilee was carried on in Greek. Greek was not only the universal language of literature; it was not less the language of commercial and of public life. Greek, in fact, was to Aramaic what English is to Welsh or Gaelic to-day, and it may be taken for granted that James knew Greek as well as the average Welshman or Highlander knows English. That our Lord was acquainted with Greek may probably be inferred from His conversation with Pilate, with the centurion, and with the Greeks who desired to see Him. The familiarity with Greek which our Lord had, James doubtless had equally. Aramaic was spoken in the home at Nazareth, but the ability to understand and speak Greek was probably possessed by most of its members.

The attendance of James at school would hardly be prolonged beyond the twelfth or thirteenth year. The latter age was, centuries after the time of James, fixed on as the period at which a Jew became 'a son of the commandments,' and as such bound to observe the entire Law (Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, App.). In the first century no uniform age was observed, but every youth as soon as the signs of manhood appeared was held bound to obey the whole Law. Perhaps before he was thirteen James had gone up to Jerusalem at one or other of the three great annual festivals. Certainly he would go up then, and probably thereafter he visited the capital regularly. These visits, together with his religious and moral training in the home and the worship of the Synagogue, were, after the example of his father and mother, the influences by which he was chiefly moulded. The life of the household in which he was brought up was one of the utmost simplicity and frugality. The furniture and meals and the dress of all the members were of the plainest kind. Luxury was unknown, just as poverty was equally unknown. The necessities of life were much cheaper in Galilee than in Judæa, and a moderate income sufficed to maintain a family in comfort. Food, clothing, and a house were readily procured by any man prepared to work. Joseph, it may be taken for granted, was diligent in business, and his trade of village carpenter or wright, though doubtless yielding him only a modest competence,

was amply sufficient to supply the wants of his family. The sons and daughters of the home would be brought up to assist their father and mother from their earliest years, and the boys would be set to work as soon as they left school. If James was next to our Lord in age, it is quite possible that, like our Lord, he may also have been a carpenter. He is designated as such by tradition (*History of Joseph*, 2), but the statement is evidently derived from the Gospels. There might not be sufficient work in Nazareth to keep three members of one household employed as carpenters. It is certain, however, at once from the custom prevailing among the Jews, from the character of his parents, and from his rank in life, that James was bred to some trade, although the particular occupation he followed must remain undetermined.

It was customary for men among the Jews to marry at the age of eighteen (Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, App. 97); and as marriage was held in the highest estimation among them, it is reasonable to conclude that James was married. Marriage was, in fact, regarded as a duty, and a maxim is quoted from the Talmud to the effect that a man without a wife is not a man (*Jebamoth*, 63a; Taylor, *Sayings*, 17; cf. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 377). But it is not necessary to infer from Jewish sentiments regarding wedlock that James was married. There need be no hesitation on the question, for Paul asserts (1 Co 9⁵) that the brothers of the Lord took their wives

with them when they went to visit the Churches or to evangelise. The conclusion that James was married, seems to follow inevitably from this statement. It has, however, been argued that Paul might have expressed himself thus had the majority of the brothers been married, even though James had remained unmarried. But is it conceivable that he would have spoken so absolutely had the most distinguished of our Lord's brothers, of whom every hearer of his letter would naturally first think, formed an exception to his statement? Still it is urged that Paul could hardly have thought of James as married, because tradition, which has far more to say regarding him than any of his brothers, does not speak of his descendants (*Zahn, Einl.* i. 74). As an argument to be weighed against Paul's assertion this consideration is of no moment; and even apart from that assertion its force is not great, for the information we possess from other than Scripture sources regarding James is scanty and in large measure untrustworthy.¹ Besides, does it follow that because no mention is made of James' descendants that he left no descendants? Would they have been mentioned had they been females only, or had they died early? Again, does it follow that if a man has no children he is not married?

It is further contended that an ascetic like James would not marry. Granting that he was an ascetic,

¹ The assertion of Epiphanius (*Hær.* lxxviii. 13) that he was a virgin is of no value.

why should he not marry? Samson and Samuel are commonly adduced as his prototypes. Were they not married? Is there any evidence that James looked on marriage with other sentiments than those of the great majority of his fellow-countrymen? Or will it be affirmed that he shared the views of the Essenes respecting it? Accordingly, there is not the shadow of a reason for rejecting the opinion that James was married.

Was James a Nazirite? Nowhere in the New Testament is he termed such. Nor is there a sentence or phrase in his own letter suggesting that he was. Yet he is commonly represented as a Nazirite, and many inferences as to his sentiments have been derived from this circumstance.

How has it come to pass that James is often described as a Nazirite? The statement that he was such is found first in its complete form in Epiphanius. But a statement of a writer in the fourth century is evidently of no historical value. Epiphanius had no personal knowledge either of the life of James or of the Nazirite vow in the first century. If his assertion is not a mere conjecture, it is probably an inference from the language of Hegesippus regarding James. Not a few scholars have drawn the same conclusion from that language as Epiphanius did. They contend that his description implies that James was a Nazirite. But if this were the case, why did Hegesippus not mention so remarkable a fact? Besides, even had he done so, his assertion would be questionable, because

the source from which he has drawn most of this information regarding James appears altogether untrustworthy. There is no reason to believe that either Hegesippus or the authority on which he depended had any direct knowledge regarding James, or that any credible tradition as to his mode of life had reached them. How then did the tradition arise? It is probably due to the suggestion made by James to Paul on the occasion of the last visit of the latter to Jerusalem. He then advised him to show his fidelity to the law of his fathers by becoming responsible for the charges of certain men who had taken a vow. This vow is commonly and perhaps justly regarded as that of the Nazirite. The counsel given by James is apparently, then, the source of the tradition that he was a Nazirite.

Many writers, while acknowledging the inadequacy of the evidence for the view that James was under a perpetual Nazirite vow, regard this as extremely probable, and accordingly describe him as such. But there is a wide gulf between the belief that James may have been a Nazirite and the proof that he was one. The reasons commonly assigned are not convincing. It is to be observed, first of all, that there is no agreement among the upholders of this opinion as to when James became a Nazirite for life. Some hold that he was such from birth, others that he took this vow in later life. How is this vital point to be determined? Who is to reconcile such diverging views?

The most widely accepted opinion is that James

was devoted to the service of God from his birth. His parents in gratitude for the unique honour done to Mary as the mother of the Messiah set him apart as a Nazirite. But there is no evidence that Joseph and Mary acted thus. Nor is there any account of their feelings at the birth of James which sanctions any such view. Is it not as probable that, with one child already destined to an extraordinary career, they should resolve to bring up the newborn babe in the ordinary way as that they should place him under the vow of a Nazirite? If they had been able to think of such a vow at all, would they not most naturally have placed our Lord under it? Besides, what is told us regarding the life of our Lord hardly favours the opinion that James was under such a vow? Our Lord's manner of life was probably derived from that observed at home. He drank wine; what ground is there for holding that James acted differently? It is answered that the tradition preserved by Hegesippus affirms that he drank no wine, and that there is no ground for rejecting this statement. But is the assertion of Hegesippus, or rather of the authority on which he depended, to be preferred to that of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the author of which was quite as likely to be correctly informed regarding the habits of James as Hegesippus? According to that *Gospel*, James was present at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and actually drank of the cup. Whatever the value of this statement as a matter of fact, it proves that in the second century and in

Jewish Christian circles James was not believed to be a Nazirite. From the fragments of the *Gospel* which have come down to us, it is evident that the author held James in the highest honour. Would he have represented him as present at the Lord's Supper, and as drinking of the cup, had he believed that he had taken a vow to drink no wine?

The theory that James was a Nazirite has been used to explain many of the real and alleged facts of his career. It has been suggested that he owned his title of the Just to his being a Nazirite. But he is never called a Nazirite before the fourth century, and he did not need to be a Nazirite to earn this designation. The supposed connection is a mere possibility, and no more credible than any other.

The tone of prophetic authority and fiery vehemence with which he speaks has been traced to the same source. If it were proved that he was not a Nazirite, would not the tone of authority remain? Is the tone not a fact on any hypothesis, and is not the obvious explanation of it to be found in his natural temperament? The alienation of our Lord's brothers has also been brought into connection with the Nazirite vow of James. But if this argument is cogent, all the brothers must have been Nazirites, for they were all estranged from our Lord. Were they all, then, Nazirites?

It has further been contended that, as a Nazirite, James may have been admitted, as Hegesippus relates, into the Sanctuary. But this is a baseless supposition.

It has been argued that the privileges assigned to the Rechabites enable us to believe that analogous privileges may have been assigned to the Nazirites. But in the case of the Rechabites trustworthy historical evidence is to be had. In the case before us that evidence, to say the least, is in dispute. Besides, there is no real parallel between the inclusion of the Rechabites among the singers in the Temple and the admission of James into the Holy Place.

The recklessness, indeed, with which even writers of distinction speak regarding Nazirites for life in the first century is extraordinary. Their existence is treated as indisputable, and John the Baptist and James are brought forward as typical instances; and it is taken for granted that they both lived according to the same rule. Now there is no evidence to show that the Baptist was a Nazirite. He is never described as such in Scripture, nor is it said that his head was unshorn. If the Baptist had his hair cut, as other Jews, the practice of James, according to Hegesippus, was different, for he states expressly that no razor came upon the head of James. Further, between the mode of life of the Baptist and that of James, according to Hegesippus, there is a striking and even cardinal difference. A principal part of the food of the Baptist was locusts. James, on the other hand, is said never to have touched flesh. It is plain, then, that the Baptist and the James of Hegesippus cannot be regarded as men living under the same rule and as such Nazirites. There is no proof that the Baptist

was a Nazirite. There is no proof that James was a Nazirite. The fact is that no evidence for the existence of Nazirites for life in the first century has as yet been adduced. That such Nazirites may have existed is possible, but that their existence has been demonstrated must be denied, for none of the statements in the Talmud can be regarded as contributing to the settlement of this question.

The assertion that James was a Nazirite for life may therefore be challenged with much reasonableness. Further, is it likely that a Nazirite for life would settle in Jerusalem? The only alleged Nazirite of New Testament times, the Baptist, lived in the desert. Was such a Nazirite likely to marry? Samson and Samuel were indeed married; but even allowing that they were Nazirites, there is no evidence that they lived the ascetic life attributed by tradition to James. Was a Nazirite likely to be chosen to occupy a chief, if not the chief place in the Church of Jerusalem? Would not his vow have restricted his movements and lessened his usefulness? But, above all, how could a Nazirite take part in the Lord's Supper? If James was a Nazirite, did he break his vow habitually when he sat down with his fellow-Christians at the Lord's Supper, or did he abstain altogether from participation in that ordinance? Either supposition is incredible, and this incredibility is the disproof of the assertion that James was a Nazirite, since the essence of the Nazirite vow was abstinence from wine and from intoxicating liquor of every kind.

It is natural to inquire whether James during the formative years of his life came under the influence either of the Pharisees, the Sadducees, or the Essenes. That he was affected by the opinions and policy of the Sadducees has never been suggested, for there is no possible affinity between his tastes and hopes and theirs. On the other hand, it has been supposed that the views of the Pharisees may have told powerfully upon him; and some find in the severely legal attitude commonly ascribed to him the proof that he embraced their tenets and practices. That James was not enrolled among the Pharisees can scarcely be questioned. That party numbered only a few thousands, and there is no reason for holding that James was ever one of them. Was he governed by the motives which led to the formation of the party? Was he more particularly of the same type as Shammai, stern, rigorous (this is the view of Edersheim), and strenuously devoted to the practice of all the rites and ceremonies enjoined by tradition? Not a tittle of evidence exists to show that he was such. And unless it be supposed that after his conversion he became altogether different from what he formerly was, and of this there is no proof, his Epistle demonstrates that of the spirit of Shammai or even of the spirit of Hillel he possessed not a trace. The feature common to these two great leaders of the school is the purpose to elaborate and define the ceremonial and ritual Law. But these aspects of the Law are altogether ignored by James. Accordingly,

it must not be taken for granted that James was a Pharisee in practice if not in name, addicted to the observance of every precept of tradition, and striving to achieve for himself perfect conformity to the will of God in this respect. He was much rather a man of the people, on whom the Pharisees would have looked down as accursed because of his ignorance of the Law.

But if James was neither a Pharisee nor a Sadducee, and probably unmoved by the views or influence of either of these parties, was he not profoundly affected by the Essenes? Did he not adopt their convictions and usages? Was he not himself an Essene? Those writers who have sought to prove that the influence of the Essenes was extensive, have not hesitated to include James among the adherents of the party. The chief evidence on which they rely is the description of his mode of life as given by Hegesippus. But that description cannot be shown to depend on the personal knowledge of Hegesippus, and is indeed probably derived from an apocryphal writing composed in the interests of a heretical sect and without the slightest regard to historical truth. Besides, the narrative of Hegesippus ascribes practices to James wholly at variance with Jewish usage; and there is not the slightest reason for accepting that portion of it which is supposed to speak of him as virtually an Essene, and for rejecting the rest. The narrative is of a piece, and must be accepted or rejected as a whole. Further, Hegesippus himself never calls James an Essene, and, indeed, there are no

clear and certain features of Essenism in the portrait he draws. The truth is, that it was impossible for a Christian to be an Essene, or for an Essene to be a Christian. Most, if not all, Essenes belonged to a brotherhood distinguished by common meals, worship, and possessions. With few exceptions they rejected marriage. All of them disbelieved in the resurrection of the body, condemned the animal sacrifices, and cherished a secret creed. Such tenets and usages are wholly alien to the spirit and laws of Christianity. (The analogies pointed out between Christianity and Essenism by Dr. Ginsburg in his article on the Essenes in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography* are at the best superficial, and certainly furnish no proof that Christianity sprang from Essenism, or that a Christian could be an Essene.)

Several changes of great importance probably occurred in the household of Nazareth before our Lord entered on His public ministry. The greatest of these would undoubtedly be the death of Joseph. The opinion that Joseph died while our Lord was living in private is probably correct. His name is not mentioned on several occasions upon which, had he been alive, it would almost certainly have been given. It can scarcely be questioned that, had her husband been alive, Mary would not have been entrusted by our Lord to the care of John (Jn 19²⁷). The fact that when our Lord visited Nazareth the names of His mother and brothers are mentioned and not that of His reputed father, suggests that he had died before

this visit (Mk 6^{1st}). Again, when it is related that His mother and brothers sought an interview with Him at Capernaum at what must have seemed to them a critical moment in His career, the inference must be that Joseph was dead; otherwise the absence of his name would be inexplicable. The earliest notice of Mary and her sons in the Gospels favours the same conclusion. Immediately after the performance of His first miracle, our Lord, accompanied by His mother and brothers and certain disciples, went down from Nazareth to Capernaum (Jn 2¹²). Joseph would almost certainly have been included in this group had he been alive. It may, then, be taken for granted that Joseph died before our Lord's public ministry began. The date of his death is altogether unknown. No credibility attaches to the statement of the *History of Joseph the Carpenter* (chaps. 10. 15. 29) that he died at the age of one hundred and eleven, and about the nineteenth year of our Lord's life (14. 15). The death of Joseph must have altered to some extent the relations between our Lord and His younger brothers. By that event He became more responsible than before for the maintenance and wellbeing of His mother and of any members of the family unable to support themselves. It would also tend to increase His moral authority within the home. The circumstance that He was now its oldest male member and probably the chief breadwinner, would add to the intrinsic weight of His character and counsels.

Other changes, too, may have taken place within the family circle before our Lord entered upon His public career. Most if not all the brothers and sisters may have set up homes of their own. This was probably the case with James, as late marriages were not common among the Jews. It is even possible that Mary and our Lord were left in the home at Nazareth alone. On the other hand, one or two members of the family may still have remained under the roof at the time when His ministry began.

CHAPTER III.

JAMES, FROM THE BEGINNING OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY TO THE RESURRECTION.

OUR Lord's brethren are first mentioned shortly after the miracle at Cana. "After this He went down to Capernaum, He, and His mother, and His brothers, and His disciples, and there they abode not many days" (Jn 2¹²). Mary's sons apparently did not accompany her to the marriage at Cana, for no notice is taken of their presence there. After the miracle our Lord and His mother, with, it would seem, the earliest disciples as their guests, returned to Nazareth; and shortly after the same company, with the addition of our Lord's brothers, went down to Capernaum, perhaps on the invitation of Andrew and Peter. They may have proposed to visit Jerusalem at the ensuing feast of the Passover. It has sometimes been asserted that our Lord's family had either already quitted Nazareth or did so on this occasion, settling in Capernaum. But would Philip have described our Lord as of Nazareth had His home been in Capernaum? (Jn 1⁴⁵). Again, the phrase "not many days" favours the view that our Lord went there to visit rather than to reside. Perhaps

what He saw of Capernaum on this occasion may have led Him to fix His residence there when He began His ministry in Galilee (Mt 4¹³). The circumstance that our Lord's brothers went with Him to Capernaum along with His disciples, is a proof of the closeness of the ties uniting our Lord and them. No shadow of estrangement had as yet fallen upon their relations. If the brothers were married by this time, the strength of their attachment to our Lord appears only the greater.

Were Mary and His brothers influenced by other motives than those of friendliness when they went down to Capernaum? Had Mary or the disciples told the brothers of the miracle at Cana? And were mother, brothers, and disciples alike elated by the hope that Jesus was about to inaugurate His Messianic career? Did they anticipate that Capernaum would be the theatre in which He would work still greater marvels than that of Cana? The casual statement of John regarding their journey hardly countenances any such opinion. No trace of the existence of such motives is found in the text. No indication is given of any connection between the miracle and the step taken by Mary and the brothers. As there is no proof that our Lord remained more than a short time at Capernaum, or wrought any miracles there, it is wiser to hold that the motives governing the action of Mary and her sons were those of ordinary friendship. (Godet on Lk 2¹² holds that they were under the impression

of the miracle of Cana, and were curious to see how the drama which had begun in so amazing a manner would unfold.)

The next occasion on which our Lord's brothers are mentioned in the Gospels is when they sought to interfere with His labours (Mk 3^{20. 21. 31}). The time was probably in the autumn of A.D. 27. He had just re-entered Capernaum, but the excitement created by His presence was such that it was impossible for Him to obtain leisure even to eat. His fame as a teacher and worker of miracles had spread abroad, and vast numbers sought to see Him and to be taught or cured by Him. Meanwhile He had become the object of the growing hostility of the religious teachers of the nation, and His popularity and miracles were viewed with malignant eyes by some who came from Jerusalem. Unable to deny the reality of His miracles, they suggested that they were wrought through His alliance with Satan. It would seem that information regarding our Lord's ceaseless enthusiasm and energy, and possibly, too, regarding the charge of complicity with Satan made by the Pharisees, reached the ears of Mary and her children in Nazareth. Unable to explain His actions, they leant to the conclusion that His mind had given way. Only thus could they account for the crowds He allowed to assemble round Him, and for His neglect of the most obvious rules of health, to say nothing of His disregard of the hostility of the Pharisees. The spiritual passion by which He was

inspired was taken by them to be a nervous excitement denoting insanity.

Whether the suggestion that our Lord's brain was affected occurred first to the family or was made to them by others cannot be known. But it is possible that the news brought to them was accompanied by some such expression of opinion. Perhaps, too, the insinuation of the Pharisees, that He was in league with Satan, if reported to them, may have confirmed their belief that His reason had given way. For His own sake, therefore, it was necessary to place Him under restraint. His mind would recover its tone and balance if only He were living quietly with them again. The crisis was grave, and hence common action was required. Accordingly Mary and her sons, and probably, too, her daughters, set out from Nazareth for Capernaum in order to bring Him home with them.

It has here been taken for granted that the friends of Jesus (Mk 3²¹) are identical with His mother and brethren (Mk 3³¹). No ordinary reader considers that the friends and the mother and brethren should be distinguished. He concludes that the address of our Lord to the scribes from Jerusalem is interposed between the narrative of the statement made by His friends and the arrival of His mother and brothers, because it was actually delivered in the interval between these events. It is contended, however, that the incidents must be distinct, the first describing the language and conduct

of certain adherents of our Lord, and the second the action of our Lord's nearest relatives. The words spoken, the step taken by the adherents, are declared to be inconceivable in the case of our Lord's mother and brothers. In this connection there has been much discussion as to the force of the phrase rendered 'His friends,' and its significance has been regarded as decisive of the question in dispute. This, however, is not the case. The expression is neutral in character. It can designate Mary and the brothers and sisters of our Lord, but it can equally denote disciples more or less intimate. The decision of the question really turns on this: Is it probable that our Lord's mother and brothers could have spoken and acted in the manner here described? Have we such knowledge of their state of mind as entitles us to argue thus? Are we so acquainted with their views touching our Lord that we can say confidently that they could not have regarded His mind as unsettled? Besides, is there less difficulty in believing that our Lord's mother and brothers pronounced Him insane and took steps to take Him home with them, than in believing that such language was used and such action taken by mere adherents? The friends are admittedly not the Twelve. They are said to have belonged to an outer circle of disciples. Were such persons likely to form any such judgment? Would they not more naturally have been lost in admiration of our Lord's absorption in His task? Would they, believing our Lord to be a prophet or

the Messiah, have ventured to take the liberty of arresting Him? Further, the narrative of Mark alone enables us to comprehend the motives of our Lord's relatives. Refuse to identify the two incidents, and the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke as to the visit paid to Capernaum by our Lord's mother and brothers become altogether obscure. The purpose which brought them there, and the tone and substance of our Lord's reply, are a hopeless riddle. A rebuke so direct and severe, however tenderly spoken, presupposes just such language and conduct as Mark describes. On all grounds, then, the conclusion obviously suggested by the text of Mark, that the two incidents are one and the same, must be accepted. (Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i. 282, distinguishes the incidents, but makes those who came to arrest Him His kinsmen and immediate family. But why in this case separate the incidents? He also (i. 325) regards Lk 8¹⁹ as different from Mt 12⁴⁶, Mk 3²¹ on account of the context. But was such an incident likely to occur a second time?)

Our Lord's mother and brothers were accompanied, according to some texts, by His sisters. If the reading be correct, it is full of significance. Our Lord's sisters almost certainly lived at Nazareth, and it would therefore seem that the news of His extraordinary labours and the popular rumours concerning Him, and possibly of the terrible charge brought against Him by the scribes from Jerusalem, had been carried to Nazareth, and that our Lord's

entire family believed it to be their duty to place Him under restraint in order to preserve His sanity. If, as is highly probable, the sisters were married women, the apprehension with which they viewed our Lord's action is only the graver. Nothing but the conviction that a crisis was impending, that the reason of their brother was in jeopardy, and that the family honour was at stake, could have induced them to act as they did.

When they arrived, our Lord was teaching in a house. His audience apparently consisted of disciples only. But their numbers were so great that it was impossible for Mary and her children to find admission. Unwilling to divulge the purpose for which they had come, they sent a message asking to speak with Him. It was passed from one to another, and at last reached our Lord in the form, "Thy mother and thy brothers without seek for Thee." There was nothing in the tone and substance of the request to create displeasure. But our Lord discerned intuitively their anxiety and their unbelief. His answer, so far as they were concerned, was a rebuke in the form of a general principle. "Who," He asked, "is My mother and My brothers?" Stretching out His hand and gazing on the crowd of disciples before Him, He exclaimed, "Behold My mother and My brothers! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is My brother, and sister, and mother."

Whether or not our Lord, after speaking thus,

saw His mother and brothers, cannot be decided. But His reply must have made it perfectly plain to them that He resented and condemned their interference. However pure their motives, they had intruded into a province which was not theirs, and had sought to arrest the work which God had given Him to do. It cannot for a moment be supposed that He believed they were influenced by vanity or pride, or wished to be known as His relatives, or to exhibit their influence over Him. He knew that it was solicitude for His welfare that had brought them there. But He recognised at the same time the difference between their motives and ideals and His, and felt that the time had come when He must kindly but firmly make this difference plain to them and to others. He had no wish to slight them. Never was His heart fuller of affection, but He felt the supreme importance of doing the will of God, and how necessary it was that He should put aside and blame any interference with that will. Doubtless none of those who listened to His words imagined that He was wanting in respect or love for His relatives. But they could not fail to be thrilled with unwonted emotion when they perceived the force of the principle He laid down. As Jews they attached the highest importance to their nationality, many of them believing that their descent constituted of itself a claim upon God. Further, no obligations were in their eyes weightier or more imperative than those of children to their parents.

But they were now taught that spiritual ties were infinitely more important than the ties of race and kindred, and that relationship to the Messiah was based on likeness of disposition and not on blood. The mother and brothers of the Messiah had no unique privilege. Every one who was willing to obey God could stand in as intimate a relation to Him as His mother, and brothers, and sisters. It was impossible for our Lord to expound more plainly His conviction of the absolute supremacy of the will of God over His own life and the lives of others, and the consequent superiority of spiritual ties to those of blood.

It is plain from this incident that not only our Lord's brothers and sisters, but even Mary herself did not understand Him. Our Lord would never have referred so pointedly to His mother had she not been as active in the movement to arrest Him as her children. It is manifest that, even though she doubtless believed Him to be the Messiah, she could still cherish the opinion that His mind had been overtaxed. Her view that He was the Messiah was perfectly compatible with the opinion that He was not invariably engaged in the Messiah's work. She evidently believed that what He was doing at this time was no part of His task as the Messiah. The brothers doubtless did not cherish her conviction that He was the Messiah, and consequently they would have still less difficulty than she had in concluding that His reason had given way.

An incidental but most important reference to our Lord's home is contained in the account of a visit to Nazareth (Mk 6¹⁻⁶ Mt 13⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸). This visit to Nazareth must be distinguished from that described in Lk 4¹⁶. For the two narratives, while similar in certain respects, differ widely in others, and these the most important. Examination shows that our Lord on the one occasion is but entering on His public life, whereas on the other He appears in the fulness of His reputation. The motives which induced our Lord to pay a second visit to Nazareth are easily understood. Notwithstanding the attempt to kill Him made on the occasion of His first visit, notwithstanding, too, the rejection of His claims by His nearest relatives, He cherished a warm affection for the village in which He had been brought up, and a still intenser love for the members of His family circle. He doubtless wished to enjoy the solace and delight of intercourse with His friends, as well as to offer again to His fellow-citizens that gospel of which He was at once the preacher and the substance. The time of the visit cannot be fixed with absolute certainty. But it took place before our Lord's popularity had begun to wane. It was apparently when His fame was at its height that, accompanied by His disciples, He returned to the village from which He derived His name of Nazarene. On His arrival He doubtless sought and found hospitality under His mother's roof. It has frequently been assumed that His mother and her sons had by this time gone to live in Capernaum. But for this

supposition there is no conclusive evidence, and the reference made by our Lord on this occasion to His own home rather suggests that His mother and brothers were still resident in Nazareth. Nor does the reference to the sisters as living in Nazareth necessarily imply that the brothers did not live there too. Such an interpretation is possible, but is not required. What, now, was the character of our Lord's relations with His mother and brothers on this occasion? Was the visit a source of unmixed joy to Him or to them? That strong personal love between them still existed, cannot be questioned. But that the shadow of distrust and even of estrangement had fallen upon them, is not less true. On the subject that lay nearest to our Lord's heart there could not be absolute confidence between them, for as yet His claims to be the Messiah were not admitted by them. His wisdom, His miracles, His success had not convinced them that He was the Messiah. Their attitude was that of doubt rather than of unbelief. They could not deny, but they could not affirm, that He was the Messiah. Their minds were in a state of vacillation. They would gladly have believed in Him, but meanwhile could not. Their attitude could hardly have remained unknown to their fellow-townsmen, and may in part have been produced by the sentiments which they knew were held within the village. As our Lord's visit to the village was not merely to find rest and quiet, and to see His relatives, but also to preach the gospel, He took advantage of the opportunity

afforded by the public worship of the Synagogue and the Sabbath to address His assembled townsmen. The subject on which He spoke has not been recorded ; but it doubtless bore on the kingdom which He had come to set up. Whether it contained any reference to Himself cannot be determined. The grace, the wisdom, the authority with which He spoke powerfully impressed His hearers. The majority were surprised at the language He used and also at the miracles which common report declared He wrought, and began to ask what was the source from which His endowments came, and what was their true nature. They had undoubtedly been given Him, but by whom ? How came He to be unlike His brothers and sisters ? He had been a carpenter : He was the son of Mary, and the brother of James, and Joses, and Jude, and Simon. His sisters also were among them. None of these possessed exceptional qualifications or had achieved exceptional distinction. Whence, then, had Jesus gained His wisdom and His miraculous powers ? Blinded by envy, they could not understand how one of themselves, with no advantages, educated among them, the disciple of no famous Rabbi, should suddenly have become one of the most prominent and distinguished persons in the land, and should be regarded by many as actually the Messiah. His power as a teacher and worker of miracles could not be questioned. His words and acts spoke for themselves. Such powers must be derived from some source. They could not be accounted for by the past

life of Jesus. They were certainly not derived from any great living teacher. Whence, then, had they come? Were they His honestly? Were they used by Him for proper ends? Might He not be other than He professed to be? Such difficulties filled them with perplexity and indignation. Unwilling to admit Him to be what His words and acts fairly interpreted proclaimed Him, they took offence at Him and declined to receive His message. Instead of regarding His career as reflecting the highest honour on their village, instead of confessing that He was a prophet and messenger of God, they insinuated to one another that the mystery attending the origin of His powers was such as to make their source more than questionable.

It is possible that whispers to this effect passed from lip to lip after our Lord had finished His address. At any rate their attitude, their gestures, their expression taught our Lord that He had spoken in vain. Accordingly He felt compelled to repeat the declaration He had made on the occasion of His former visit, "A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house." These words of our Lord's (Mk 6⁴) illustrate strikingly the extent of the unbelief of His fellow-townsmen. Even His kinsmen, even the members of His own family, had not received Him as a prophet. From this language it is apparent that the nearest relatives of our Lord remained in unbelief. His visit was ineffectual so far as their conversion was concerned. Further, the frame of mind of the Nazarenes, their hostility, or,

at any rate, their distrust, rendered it impossible for Him to perform among them those miraculous cures which He would gladly have wrought. One of the conditions of these cures was faith, and that faith existed only among a few, and apparently but to a limited extent. He was only able to lay His hands on a few sick folk and heal them. The unbelief of His fellow-townsmen filled our Lord with profound surprise. He had expected to be received differently. He had cherished the hope that now that His fame was established His message might have been welcomed, and that such faith would have been reposed in Him as the Founder of the kingdom of God that He would have been able to make full use of His miraculous resources. To His astonishment His reception was cold and even hostile, and He was therefore morally unable to perform the acts of healing and of mercy He had contemplated.

The last mention of the brothers of our Lord in the Gospels is in connection with the Feast of Tabernacles preceding His death, 29th October (Jn 7^s). By this time our Lord had ceased to be popular. The manner in which He had rejected the crown that would have been thrust upon Him had alienated the great body of His adherents in Galilee. It might then have been supposed that He would have gone into Judæa to see whether He could achieve better results there. But this was impossible, because the authorities were eager to compass His death. Hence our Lord, unwilling

to precipitate His fate, remained in Galilee. At the preceding Passover He had not gone up to the metropolis, and it appeared that He had no intention of repairing thither at this feast. This conduct was inexplicable to our Lord's brothers. It seemed to them most unwise. Accordingly, they counselled Him to go up to the capital and there announce Himself as the Messiah. Only in Jerusalem could the Messianic kingdom be inaugurated. There and there only could His title to be the Messiah be tested and determined. His disciples from all quarters of the land would be found at the festival. And if they only witnessed the miracles that He was performing in comparative privacy in Galilee they would undoubtedly declare in His favour. If Jesus wished to be accepted as the Messiah, the miracles He wrought should be done in the face of the world. To profess to be the Messiah and to work miracles known only to a few, was to act inconsistently. A wise man did nothing in secret which he wished to be openly known. It is expressly said by John that our Lord's brothers in giving this advice did not believe in Him (7⁵). No doubt the motives influencing the brothers were of the most honourable kind. To attribute to them, as has sometimes been done, malice or treachery or even vanity, is to treat them unjustly. They were solicitous for His honour and theirs. They wished their own doubts set at rest. His miracles formed the ground of faith in Him. They should

then be wrought in the most public manner, and thus the whole nation would be brought to admit His claims. It is not necessary to suppose that our Lord's miracles were less open than before. What the brothers desired was that they should be performed at the national festival now approaching, where they could be seen and estimated by all. Their Brother's action on so small and contracted a scale was to them incomprehensible. True wisdom dictated that He should quit Galilee for Jerusalem, work miracles there, and so announce Himself to the whole Jewish people as the Messiah.

It is plain from the language of John that the unbelief of the brothers was a surprise to him when he wrote the Gospel. Our Lord's brothers might naturally have been expected to be among the earliest of His disciples. Their familiarity with His character and life was unrivalled. None knew so well His utter unselfishness, His stainless purity, His absolute obedience to the will of God. Besides, their opportunities of witnessing His miracles were also great. How then is their unbelief to be explained? Doubtless their very intimacy with our Lord blinded them to His real greatness. It never occurred to James or his brothers or sisters that Jesus was so very different from themselves. Probably they never realised that He was sinless or perfect, still less that He was the Redeemer of man and Himself God.

Again, His life and teaching caused them much

perplexity. His ideals and methods were other than theirs. His view of the kingdom of God, His conception of the functions of the Messiah, and of the means by which the kingdom was to be established, were wholly different from theirs. In common with the rest of the nation they believed that the Messiah was to be a great national hero who was to throw off the yoke of Rome, set Himself on the throne of David in Jerusalem, and wield there the sceptre which would determine the destinies of all the nations of the earth. The Messiah of popular expectation was a warrior king. Accordingly the peaceful career of our Lord generated doubts in the minds even of those most favourably disposed towards Him. The originality of His teaching, its purity and elevation, and even its extraordinary power and authority, could not dispel these doubts. If He were the Messiah, He would certainly make some effort to rally the nation to His standard in order to destroy the hated domination of Rome. Further, the members of our Lord's family, just because of their ordinary education and low social rank, were the more dependent on the judgment of others, and hence were strongly affected by the doubts so widely felt regarding His claims.

The reply of our Lord to the counsel of His brothers reveals the cleavage existing between their modes of thought and His. He doubtless recognised that the advice given Him was well intentioned and friendly. He did full justice to their motives, but

He felt that it was impossible to comply with their request. This impossibility He made plain by stating that the attitude of the world to Him was altogether different from its attitude to them. They were at all times free to go up to Jerusalem or not. They would encounter no danger when there, for they thought and spoke and acted like the rest of their fellow-countrymen. The world and they were on excellent terms, for they belonged to the world. Hence the world could not hate them. But it hated Him, and the ground of its hatred was that He bore witness to the evil which it tolerated and cherished. Wherever He went He came into collision with it, because its motives and purposes were alien to the will of God. He was compelled to denounce its moral standard, its modes of thought, its aspirations, its achievements. Its works He condemned as evil because not in accordance with the will of God. Such condemnation elicited the hostility of the world. The time of His manifestation was not yet come. He would show Himself to the world. He would proclaim Himself in the capital as the Messiah. But in doing so He must select the proper moment.

Our Lord's brothers cannot have comprehended His answer fully. Had they understood His words, they would doubtless have been appalled by the revelation which they gave of the consequence of acting on their counsel. When their brother revealed Himself in Jerusalem as the Messiah, it

was to enter on the way to His death. The cross of Calvary was the throne of David.

No plainer indication of the state of mind of our Lord's brothers, within six months of His death, could be given than that furnished by His assertion "that they were of the world." This clearly proves that as yet they did not believe in His mission or accept His teaching. They may have wished to do so. Perhaps they would gladly have believed in Him; but believe in Him they did not.

Jesus remained in Galilee; the brothers went to the feast. They heard His pretensions discussed on every side. Opinion was strongly divided regarding Him. But the populace hesitated to avow openly their convictions, whether hostile or favourable, until the hierarchy had spoken. What effect the visit to the Feast of Tabernacles had upon the brothers is unknown. Probably they quitted the capital in much the same state of mind as they entered it.

These are the only passages in the Gospels which refer to our Lord's brothers. The circumstance that James is never mentioned apart from the rest is plainly significant. Had he been other than they, had his views or practices been separate, some notice of this would almost certainly have been preserved. The fact that none of our Lord's brothers is distinguished from the rest, shows that so long as He lived they were practically one in sentiment and mode of life.

No further reference is made to the brothers of our Lord in the Gospels, and accordingly it is impos-

sible to say what view they took of the later stages of our Lord's career. It is not probable that their opinions underwent any change. They continued in suspense to the last moment of His life, and His execution probably served to extinguish the last gleams of the hope that He might be the Messiah. Whether they were in Jerusalem at that event is a point as to which evidence is wanting. There is nothing in the Gospels which indicates their presence. Not much stress can be laid on the argument that as pious Jews they would be sure to repair to the capital at the Passover, as this practice, though general, was not rigidly observed. Nor can any unquestionable conclusions be drawn from the fact that our Lord when dying committed His mother to the care of John. This action is undoubtedly more easily understood if the brothers were absent from Jerusalem for a time. But it might have been taken even though they, like Mary and John, had been standing by the Cross. As there is, then, no positive proof that the brethren were in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion, it is improper to take for granted, as has been often done, that they were there. (Plumptre, *James*, 21, believes that the brethren were present at the Crucifixion.) But to affirm confidently that they were absent is equally inadmissible.

Our Lord when dying entrusted His mother to the charge of John. What light is cast by this action on the relations between His mother, His brothers,

and Himself? The step, it has been argued, is a demonstration that the brothers were not the children of Mary. Our Lord could not have commanded John to become a son to Mary had James and his brothers been her sons. Such action is hardly credible in itself, and is rendered still less credible by the circumstance that the brothers immediately became Christians, and are mentioned as present in Jerusalem along with Mary after the Ascension. Could our Lord, it is asked, have snapt asunder the most sacred ties of natural affection and committed His mother to the care of a stranger while her sons were living in the same city? (Lightfoot, *Gal.* 264-5). These considerations are weighty, but cannot disprove the testimonies which show that the brothers of the Lord were the children of Mary. Besides, they tell almost as powerfully against the opinion that they were step-brothers as against the opinion that they were full brothers. For the manner in which Mary is spoken of along with the brothers proves that the ties between them were of the strongest and tenderest. They invariably treated her as their mother and regarded themselves as her sons. Why, then, did our Lord pass over such step-brothers and entrust His mother to a so-called stranger? Is not this conduct almost as inexplicable on the Epiphanian as on the Helvidian theory? The difficulty is real and great on any hypothesis, when the relations between Mary and the brothers as set forth in the Gospels are borne in mind. Nor is it greatly diminished on the

assumption that the stranger was our Lord's nephew, the son of Salome, and the nearest relative by blood of our Lord. For obviously, according to the Gospels, the brethren of our Lord stood in a much closer relation to Mary than John did. Moreover, on this view, John had a mother of his own, who may also, like Mary, have been a widow. Why, then, was Mary given as a mother to a disciple who had a mother of his own, and who may possibly have been a widow living under his roof? Probably the motive which governed our Lord was love for His mother. No distrust or disapproval of His brothers mingled with that love. Were all the facts known, the step would appear natural and befitting. Mary might have been able to obtain in the house of John comfort, quiet, and attention otherwise beyond her reach. The brothers of the Lord were probably married. If John were unmarried, what more becoming than that Mary should spend the rest of her life with him? Why should not the two persons who apparently enjoyed most of our Lord's affection have been given to one another by our Lord? Besides, is it not possible to make too much of the ties of 'natural affection,' in this matter? Is it certain that our Lord would have granted a supreme place to mere relationship? Would He not have subordinated the ties of blood to the higher consideration of what was best for His mother and for all concerned? It may then be concluded that the committal of Mary to John is no

proof that the relations between her and her sons were changed for the worse. Mother and sons were still as dear to one another as before. It was the same with the brothers of Jesus. He did not deem them unworthy or unfit to take charge of His mother, but He knew that in the house of John she would be better provided for than anywhere else.

It has already been suggested that the Crucifixion destroyed any hopes that our Lord's brothers may have cherished that He was the Messiah. His death was the verdict of God on His claims. However highly they honoured His character, however keenly they resented His unjust sentence, they could not but esteem it impossible to hold now that He was the Messiah. The faith even of the Apostles was shattered by His execution, how much more that of the brothers who had never owned His claims! Moreover, the notion of a resurrection was still more foreign to the minds of the brothers than to those of the Apostles.

Jesus rose from the dead, and among those to whom He appeared was James (1 Co 15⁷). It would seem as if this were among the last of our Lord's appearances during the forty days. The place cannot be determined. It may have been Galilee; it may have been Jerusalem. If James was not in Jerusalem at the Passover, the place was probably somewhere in Galilee, possibly Nazareth. This appearance to James is the only one not made to a known believer. Had

any rumours of the resurrection previously reached James? Had he learned that Jesus had appeared to His disciples in Jerusalem? Did his mother inform him that Jesus had indeed risen from the dead and had spoken with the Twelve? Had his doubts begun to give way? Had they vanished, or was he still in perplexity? Whatever his state of mind, he soon received personal confirmation of the resurrection. His Brother appeared to him. Only the fact is recorded. What would we not give for even a few fragments of the conversation then held? How gentle the blame with which our Lord censured His brother for his unbelief! How deep that brother's self-reproach and shame! that he of all others should not have recognised the Messiah! that kinsmen and strangers should have had keener spiritual discernment than himself! that he should have been deaf and blind to the evidence that persuaded them!—and such evidence! If he had only weighed it as he should! The interview dispelled for ever his own conception of the Messiah, and rendered him thenceforward a whole-hearted and energetic Christian.

The opinion that James owed his conversion to an appearance of the risen Lord has been disputed on the ground that our Lord appeared to believers only, not to unbelievers; and it has been suggested that his unbelief gave way when he heard from Mary his mother and from the Apostles that Jesus had risen from the dead (Dale, *Epistle of James*, 5). This opinion is quite tenable, because, in the absence of

any report as to the conversion of James, we are left to weigh probabilities, and the explanation that he was led by the testimony of his mother and the Apostles to abandon his unbelief is in no way improbable. At the same time, it is not more worthy of acceptance, probably less so, than the view commonly adopted. The general law to which it appeals, that our Lord after His resurrection manifested Himself only to those who had already believed on Him, is not laid down in Scripture, and is a mere inference from His appearances as recorded there. For anything known to the contrary, the case of James may have differed from all the other cases mentioned. That the principle is not absolute is shown by the appearance of our Lord to Paul, an instance which cannot be detached from the rest, for Paul himself treats it as similar. If our Lord, then, appeared to Paul to create faith, He may have acted in the same way towards James. If James still doubted even after he had heard of the resurrection, what more signal proof of his Brother's love for him and desire that he should be His could have been given than a special manifestation of Himself such as He vouchsafed to Peter? It is easier to explain the appearance to James on the hypothesis that he was an unbeliever than on the hypothesis that he was a believer: all the more as, unlike the others to whom our Lord appeared, he was probably not a believer until after the resurrection. A manifestation of our Lord to produce faith is more probable than one to strengthen faith; for what James

needed was to be convinced of the resurrection. Once sure of this fact, his faith became as a rock.

An account of our Lord's appearance to James is contained in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and has frequently been regarded as embodying an authentic tradition. The originality and simplicity of the narrative are pronounced not unworthy of the genuine Gospels (Mayor, *James*, xxxvii). The passage which deserves careful examination is, with Jerome's explanatory observations, as follows (*de Vir. Illust.* 2): "The Gospel entitled according to the Hebrews, which I lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often quotes, contains the following narrative after the resurrection. 'Now the Lord, when He had given the cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour on which he had drunk the cup of the Lord till he saw Him risen from the dead. Again a little afterwards the Lord says, Bring a table and bread. Immediately it is added: He took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread; for the Son of Man has risen from the dead.'"

What opinion should be formed of this narrative? Is it trustworthy? The principal statement which it makes is that James took the vow described. Is it reasonable or possible to believe that he made any such vow? The vow is plainly the expression of a triumphant faith in the future resurrection of our

Lord. Now, that James believed in our Lord at the date of the Supper is contrary to all the evidence we possess. Yet he is not only represented as a believer, but as possessing a faith to which Peter and the Apostles were utter strangers. So certain is he that the resurrection is near, that he will vow not to eat again till it is accomplished. It is needless to point out how utterly contradictory to the Gospels is this representation of the mood and expectations of any of those who partook of the Last Supper. The account of the vow from first to last is fiction, and fiction which utterly misconceives the situation of our Lord and His Apostles at the time. The terms of the alleged vow are chiefly taken from our Lord's words regarding Himself, "I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come" (Lk 22¹⁸), and placed in the lips of James. The passage, then, contains not a genuine tradition, but a pure fabrication. This conclusion regarding the main assertion of the narrative is confirmed by a close examination of the other assertions which it makes. It takes for granted, in contradiction to the entire New Testament, that the appearance to James was either the first or one of the first made to any person (Zahn, *Einkl.* i. 78, holds that it is represented as the first to any one). Further, the handing of the grave-clothes to the servant of the priest, probably Malchus, betrays the purely apocryphal nature of the story. Still more incredible is the statement that James was present at the Last Supper. This view rests on the

assumption that James was one of the Twelve, a view which cannot be reconciled with the declarations of Scripture, and is at variance with the oldest Palestinian traditions regarding him, as reported by Hegesippus. This difficulty is so insuperable that some scholars believe that the original text referred to our Lord's death and not to the institution of the Eucharist (Lightfoot, *Gal.* 266; Harnack, *Chron.* 650), and argue in favour of the reading: *biberat calicem Dominus*. But this reading and interpretation are both precarious. The position of 'Dominus' is unusual. And it is questionable whether such a Gospel as that to the Hebrews would have employed a figurative designation of our Lord's death. Further, the references to the table, the placing and the breaking of bread, undoubtedly suggest that the incident referred to is the institution of the Lord's Supper and not the death of Christ. It is further urged (Lightfoot, *l.c.*) that even though the writer represented James as present at the Last Supper, it does not follow that he regarded him as one of the Twelve. This conclusion is not impossible, but it is unlikely, because no other except the Twelve are stated to have been present at the Last Supper. It is, of course, conceivable that the writer may have regarded him as present, along with the Twelve, on account of his high dignity.

Accordingly, no credence is to be attached to the statements of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* regarding James. Its divergence from other authorities

is so great as to deprive it of any historical value. This would be the case even though it were composed as early as between 70 and 100 (Harnack, *Chron.* 650). Such a date is not supported by any evidence of value; but, even though it were established, the trustworthiness of the statements would need to be rejected and the narrative pronounced a fabrication. It is inconceivable that an account composed at Pella among Christians, shortly after the death of James, should have given so erroneous a report of many of the most certain facts in the early history of Christianity. How could Jewish Christians shortly after the death of James have represented him as present at the Last Supper? How could they have described him as one of the Twelve? How could they, against the evidence of all the Gospels, have described him as a Christian? And, to crown all, how could they have described him as not only a Christian, but as confident that Jesus would rise again?

Even though the opinion be adopted that the incident referred to is our Lord's death and not the Last Supper, James is still on this hypothesis a Christian and a believer in the resurrection. Yet the Gospels show no trace of his presence among the Christians in Jerusalem. He is never mentioned as near the Cross. He is not named with the women to whom our Lord appeared, or with the Apostles. His Brother's manifestation to him is amongst the latest and not among the earliest of His appearances,

while to the story told by the author it is vital that Jesus should have first appeared to him. If an early date, then, must be assigned to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the work must be declared a mere fiction. For the hypothesis that it embodies an independent and possibly trustworthy tradition regarding the resurrection and our Lord's appearance to James is discredited by its contents. It may be pronounced certain that no such tradition could have existed among the Jewish Christians of the Holy Land, for the traditions existing among them are embodied in our present Gospels. Who can believe that a Gospel describing the resurrection itself, and representing the guard placed at the grave as friendly to our Lord, contains what was the accepted belief among Jewish Christians between 70 and 100?

An attempt has been made to preserve what are alleged to be the main facts of the tradition contained in the passage from the *Gospel to the Hebrews*. According to this representation, James, convinced by the reports which reached him concerning the resurrection, bound himself by an oath not to eat or drink until he too had seen the Lord (Farrar, *Early Christianity*). What is this but to rationalise the tradition? It certainly removes from it all that is incredible, but in doing so transforms its character and deprives it of all interest. The essence of the tradition is the faith of James and its reward, but this revised version rejects the alleged faith.

The source of the legendary story is doubtless the

statement of Paul that our Lord appeared to James (1 Co 15⁷). A Jewish Christian writer expanded this statement into a story which extolled James as the most splendid instance of faith in our Lord's resurrection.

Whether the writer was conscious how widely he departed from the truth of history cannot be known. But it is hardly doubtful that he found his starting-point in the narrative of Paul. This opinion has been rejected on the ground that the Nazarenes did not read the letters of Paul (Zahn, *Gesch. d. Kan.* ii. 716), and the writer is said to have derived his knowledge from oral tradition. But is it certain that the Nazarenes did not possess the letters of Paul, and that they were wholly unacquainted with their contents? To reject the authority of certain books is one thing, to make no use of their contents is quite another. What is the value of an oral tradition which is notoriously inconsistent with history, and merely states a fact which has been the common possession of the Christian Church ever since its origin? Why seek in oral tradition the source of a statement contained in the First Epistle to the Corinthians?

CHAPTER IV.

JAMES, FROM THE ASCENSION TO THE CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM.

THE Ascension of our Lord seems to have taken place in the presence of the Eleven only. Perhaps it is hardly proper to infer from this fact that they stood nearer to Him than His mother, brothers, and sisters, or than friends like Lazarus, Martha, and Mary. Their official relation to Him may sufficiently account for their being the sole witnesses of His departure from the earth.

Immediately after the Ascension, our Lord's mother and brothers are mentioned as assembling for Christian worship along with the Eleven and those women who had ministered to our Lord.

They met in the chief room of a private house in Jerusalem, doubtless in expectation of the fulfilment at an early date of the promise regarding the Holy Spirit. By this time all our Lord's brothers had been won for the new faith. The suggestion had often been made that they were converted through the agency of James; and this opinion is highly probable. What more natural than that they should receive

his testimony? If he were the oldest, and also the ablest and most energetic among them, they would not hesitate to accept his evidence. The fact of the resurrection was to them the destruction of all their doubts regarding their Brother's Messiahship.

It is impossible to say whether their conversion took place in Galilee or Jerusalem. No evidence exists to show that the Lord's brothers were, as is frequently taken for granted, in Jerusalem at the Passover. If they remained in Galilee, their conversion would take place there; but that event would naturally constrain them to repair to the capital. Their mother was there; the most intimate disciples of Jesus were there; the new community was to be baptized with the Holy Spirit there. Accordingly they left their home in Nazareth or Capernaum and betook themselves to the metropolis, perhaps without deciding whether they would settle in it or not.

There can be little doubt that the accession of the brethren of Jesus to the new community was a source of profound satisfaction to the Eleven and to the rest of the believers. Nor was it unimportant. Just as the unbelief of our Lord's brothers must have influenced some in refusing to admit His claims, so their belief must have had a contrary result. Is the fact that our Lord's mother and brothers are mentioned in the opening chapter of Acts side by side with the Eleven and the women who followed Him an evidence of the effect produced by their

conversion, and of the place which they at once gained in the primitive Church?

The first step taken by the new community was to elect a successor to Judas. The suggestion to do so came from Peter, to whom the leadership of the community was at once conceded. Why was not James proposed for the vacancy? Why did Peter not nominate him, and the Church appoint him by acclamation? His relationship to our Lord, the strength and massiveness of his character, his personal influence, must have been acknowledged by all. The answer that he was too recent a convert is wholly inadequate. It is a reply much more in harmony with the practice of the twentieth century than of the first century; and, besides, the purity and weight of his life abundantly compensated for this disadvantage. The answer, then, to this question must be sought elsewhere. It is doubtless this: that James did not possess the qualification needed for the office. That qualification is expressly stated by Peter, in his speech, to be association with the Twelve from the baptism of John onwards. This condition was one which James did not fulfil. He had not been in the company of the Twelve during our Lord's ministry, and he was therefore ineligible as the successor of Judas. Had James possessed the necessary title, and had the office of Apostle been regarded as one of special dignity, there is no reason why even at this early date he should have been passed over. That Peter, after James had become a

ASCENSION TO CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM 79

member of the Christian community, should lay down as a qualification for admission among the Twelve a condition which excluded James from the apostleship, is a fact the significance of which should not be lost sight of.

Eight or ten years pass during which there is no mention of James. Meanwhile the Christian Church had increased rapidly in Jerusalem. Its adherents were numbered by thousands. Its leaders had been arrested and condemned to be scourged by the Sanhedrin in order that they should cease to proclaim Jesus as the Messiah, but had refused to be intimidated. At length a persecution of extraordinary fierceness broke out against the new faith, and in it Stephen the first Christian martyr fell. Not long after, the most active as well as the most brilliant and accomplished of the persecutors became a convert. The conversion of Paul may be assigned to 35-37, and in the third year thereafter he paid his first visit to Jerusalem. His purpose was to see Peter. He saw James as well, for he states "other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother" (Gal 1¹⁹). Does Paul in these words designate James as an Apostle? The subject has formed the theme of constant debate, but the great body of unbiassed opinion has pronounced in the affirmative. This is certainly the most obvious sense of the words, and is apparently demanded by the context. It is true that the laws of grammar allow of the view that James instead of being called an Apostle is rather

excluded from the number. But this interpretation of the words is inconsistent with the purpose of the writer. It may then be concluded that Paul describes James as an Apostle. But it does not follow from this that he conceived that he had been admitted into the number of the Twelve, for he evidently did not regard him as belonging to that body (1 Co 15). Nor is it certain that James was known in Jerusalem by the title Apostle at this early date. The language of the Epistle to the Galatians is compatible with his having received that designation at any time before the letter was written. Yet no reason exists for setting aside the natural view that James was even thus early spoken of in Jerusalem as an Apostle. The history of the use of the term 'Apostle' is obscure, but the supposition that it was already employed in this sense in Jerusalem, say in 39, is consistent with all that is known regarding the origin and employment of the term. Another view is that Paul may have been the first to call James an Apostle. The term 'Apostle' was used by Paul to denote others besides the Twelve, and he might therefore have regarded it as peculiarly appropriate to James. But in the use of titles, would Paul deviate from the common practice? Would he be the first to bestow new designations on his fellow-Christians? Is it not almost certain that he would follow common usage? Still, even on the assumption that Paul's employment of the term differed from that current among the Jewish Christians, James must, in the view of

ASCENSION TO CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM 81

Paul and of the Pauline Churches, have possessed the qualifications of an Apostle, and been known by that designation.

Whether James was an Apostle or not at the date of this visit of Paul, it is evident that he occupied a high position in the Church. The mention of his name along with that of Peter is sufficient proof of this. To what was this position due? Was it to his ability, or his relationship to our Lord, or to both these factors combined? To ignore the fact of James' relationship to our Lord would be unwise. But to regard it as the determining element which fixed his position within the Christian community is still more unwise. The truest explanation of his eminence is doubtless his character and endowments.

How did James receive Paul at this time? What were the relations between them? The difficulties connected with the accounts in Galatians and Acts of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem have not yet been completely solved. How it came to pass that his conversion was not known in Jerusalem must remain undetermined. It is not quite certain from Paul's narrative in Galatians whether or not he expected to be the first to mention his conversion. But it is probable that he regarded the fact as known. On his arrival, however, in the metropolis, Paul found himself an object of suspicion. The Christians shrank from intercourse with him, because they did not believe that he was one of them. There is no reason to suppose that this doubt was not felt by Peter and

82 JAMES THE LORD'S BROTHER

James quite as much as by the general body of Christians. Paul would naturally approach the leaders of the community in the first instance, and the hesitation of which Luke speaks was most certainly entertained by Peter and James. The intervention of Barnabas removed this doubt from their minds and led them to bestow a frank and cordial welcome on Paul. The statement of Paul, that he saw only Peter and James at this time, has given rise to much discussion and speculation. It has been conjectured and even asserted that Paul saw no others because they were unwilling to meet with him, and that it early became apparent that agreement between him and the Christian community in Jerusalem was out of the question. But of all this there is nothing in the statement that he saw none of the Apostles except Peter and James. Doubtless the sole reason why he saw none of them was that none of them happened to be in Jerusalem at the time. That they had quitted Jerusalem as a body is not to be supposed, but that all of them may have been absent during the fifteen days which Paul spent in the capital is readily conceivable. It is absurd to hold that John and his fellow-Apostles declined to meet with Paul even after Peter and James had conferred with him, and it is purely gratuitous to believe that they were aware of any difference between his views and theirs, or that they would for one moment have treated him otherwise than Peter and James did.

But is it the case that James received him as

Peter did? It is generally allowed that Peter at once opened his heart and his home to him, and treated him from the first as a brother. Nothing was left undone to show his cordial admiration and esteem for the former persecutor, now become a disciple. But James, it is argued, acted differently. His nature, his convictions, his modes of life were alien to those of Paul. It was impossible for him to extend to Paul the same frank and hearty welcome which Peter did. The two men had only to meet in order to discover how radical was the divergence between them. Their character and aims were so dissimilar that they could have little satisfactory intercourse with one another. But what is the evidence for this opinion? What proof is there that there was no sympathy, no fellowship between Paul and James? It is alleged that the Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians describe the relations between them as of a formal character (Farrar, *St. Paul*, i. 234). But such an account of the testimony of Acts, and still more of the Epistle to the Galatians, is almost grotesque. Not a word in either of these works proves that the personal relations between Paul and Peter were different from those between Paul and James. Paul merely mentions that he went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and remained with him fifteen days; and that of the other Apostles he saw none, except James the Lord's brother. If from this statement it can be inferred that Peter at once took Paul to his heart, why should an opposite inference be drawn in the case of James?

The opposite inference is due to a conception of the character and principles of James for which there is no foundation. It is taken for granted that James was a "legalist, a Nazirite, almost an Essene" (Farrar, *St. Paul*, i. 233). But this assumption is baseless, and certainly finds no support in the statements of the New Testament. It is an error, then, to conclude that James treated Paul otherwise than Peter did. From both he received the same frank welcome and unflinching kindness.

To seek to construct in imagination the conversation between Paul and James is unnecessary. There can be no doubt that James would be able to communicate much to Paul regarding the life of our Lord, and doubtless Paul in turn had much to say to James concerning his experience of the power of the risen and ascended Messiah.

The name of James reappears some years later, in 44. Herod Agrippa was at this time, through the favour of Claudius, in possession of as extensive a territory as his grandfather, and was pursuing a policy of self-interest and enjoyment tempered by love of popularity. He was eager to ingratiate himself at once with the Romans and his own subjects. Accordingly at Cæsarea he played the Roman and Greek, while in Jerusalem he was the orthodox Jew. He seems to have resided much in the capital, and to have speedily perceived how disliked and detested was the new sect of the Nazarenes. They were more obnoxious than ever to the Sadducees and Pharisees,

ASCENSION TO CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM 85

and were no longer protected by public veneration and confidence. The charges of disloyalty to the Mosaic institutions, so frequently brought against them, had deeply influenced the common people, who, as they narrowly scanned the lives and practices of the Christians, discerned that their thoughts and ideals were other than their own. This change of opinion seems to have begun when Stephen perished, and it grew stronger with the passing years. The Nazarenes were now the victims of hatred and obloquy. Herod was quick to discern in this condition of affairs an opportunity of adding to his reputation as a defender of the faith. Accordingly he issued instructions that James the son of Zebedee should be arrested. He was tried, condemned, and beheaded; and the mode of execution renders it probable that he was sentenced by the king or one of his judges. This act was so popular that Herod followed it up by a still more decisive step. He caused Peter, the acknowledged leader of the Christian community, to be put in prison to await his trial, probably on an indictment for treason or blasphemy. Only the intervention of the Passover prolonged his life. As soon as that festival was over, it was the intention of the king to have him tried, condemned, and executed in presence of the vast concourse then assembled. But Peter was saved by the interposition of God. Though chained to two soldiers who shared his cell, and guarded by other two outside, he was set free by an angel, in what was to him a vision until

its reality forced itself on his senses. Comprehending at last what had occurred, he proceeded to the house of Mary the mother of John Mark, which was probably the centre of Christian fellowship in Jerusalem. There he found a number of his fellow-believers assembled to intercede for his release, and to them he rehearsed the story of his deliverance. Before withdrawing into the necessary concealment, he gave charge that his escape should be made known to James and to the brethren.

What inference can be drawn from this instruction of Peter? Had the position of James become still more definite and lofty? Was he now the acknowledged local head of the community? Was he practically its ruler? Was his authority within the Church of Jerusalem as great as, or even greater than, that of the Apostles themselves? These questions admit of no satisfactory answer, for the mere mention of the name of James in this connection does not permit us to draw such ample conclusions as these. It is incontestable that James filled a prominent place in the community; but that he was its sole or chief ruler, or that his voice within the Church of Jerusalem was as potent as that of the Apostles, is not a valid deduction from this expression. Undoubtedly, however, it may be inferred that James stood in a position of special authority in the Church of Jerusalem, and that he was regarded as its most eminent member, the Apostles excepted. It is, however, by no means clear that his position in 44 was more authoritative

ASCENSION TO CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM 87

than in 37-40. There is nearly as much evidence to show that he was a foremost member of the Church in Jerusalem in 37-40 as in 44.

It has been suggested that the vacancy in the number of the Twelve caused by the execution of James the son of Zebedee was filled by the appointment of James the Lord's brother.¹ The conjecture is ingenious and striking, but is exposed to not a few serious objections. Without dwelling on the fact that James did not fulfil the terms of admission to the apostolate laid down by Peter when Matthias was chosen, and without discussing the question whether an Apostle could properly fix his residence in Jerusalem, it is enough to call attention to the following considerations. Paul, as we have seen, calls James an Apostle, but just as clearly distinguishes him from the original Apostles (1 Co 15⁶⁻⁷). Would he have done so had James fourteen years previously been elected as one of the Twelve? Again, why should Luke, who records the election of Matthias, not have recorded the still more memorable election of James? Is it certain or even probable that any successor to the son of Zebedee was chosen? Would not this imply at least that the number of the Apostles should be kept at Twelve as long as possible? But of any such endeavour there is no trace in history. The election of Matthias appears to have been a step by itself, and it is questionable whether any successor was ever chosen

¹ Hort, *Jud. Chr.* 62; *Chr. Eccl.* 77.

to any of the Twelve except Judas. The propriety of the election of a successor to Judas is almost self-evident, but the propriety of any future election becomes clear only on the assumption that the apostolate was intended to be a permanent office; and this view, it is generally conceded, cannot be maintained. It is difficult to perceive why Luke should have omitted the appointment or election of James to the apostolate had he been aware of it. That the circumstances of the case so clearly point to his election that the fact did not require to be stated cannot be said. On the hypothesis that he was chosen as an Apostle, the failure of Luke to record the appointment is only the more significant, in view of the circumstance that he never terms him an Apostle even when describing the lofty position which he filled. Again, Hegesippus speaks of James as receiving the government of the Church along with the Apostles. He could hardly have written thus, had any tradition reached him that James became one of the Twelve. There is, then, no positive evidence either within or without the New Testament to prove that James was enrolled among the Twelve.

Again, on this assumption, there comes up the question, when was James chosen as an Apostle? It could not have been immediately after the death of James the son of Zebedee, for there was probably no time between his execution and the arrest of Peter to allow of any such step being taken by the Church. At most only a short interval can have

ASCENSION TO CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM 89

elapsed between the arrest and execution of James and the subsequent arrest of Peter, and the Church could not during this interval have proceeded to elect James as a successor to the son of Zebedee. The election, if it took place at all, must have been after the deliverance of Peter. It is quite conceivable that James was then formally chosen in the place of the son of Zebedee. But the question at once occurs, what was the significance or value of such an appointment to James? Peter's command to inform James of his escape clearly proves that James was then a leading member, if not the leading member, of the Church in Jerusalem. If his position in the Church of Jerusalem was thus lofty, if his influence was equal to that of any of the Apostles, what need was there that he should be chosen as an Apostle? It is only on the view that the office or dignity of Apostle was the highest in the Church, and that the position and influence of a man like James can only be satisfactorily explained on the hypothesis that he was an Apostle, that the necessity of his election becomes in the least manifest. But of the prevalence of such ideas in the first age of the Church there is no proof. To suppose that the elevation of James to the apostolate was the crown and seal of his ascendancy within the community, is to transfer the views and sentiments of later ages to the first century.

Connected with the execution of James and the deliverance of Peter, is a visit to Jerusalem made by

Paul and Barnabas bearing a contribution from the Church at Antioch for the relief of the wants of the Church of Jerusalem, then suffering from the effects of a dearth. This visit may have occurred before or at the same time as the death of James and the arrest of Peter. A careful study of the narrative favours the view that the visit took place subsequent to these events. On any other explanation, the separation of the parts of the narrative descriptive of the incident (Ac 11³⁰ 12²⁵) can hardly be understood. Not a few questions of great importance in connection with the history of the early Church cluster round this visit of Paul and Barnabas, and several of these bear on the present subject. One of them is as to the condition of matters when Paul and Barnabas arrived in Jerusalem. Was the Church in terror and confusion? Had the Apostles fled? Did they not see a single Apostle? Was even James absent?

An answer to these questions has been sought for in a determination of the date of the famine spoken of. But even though the date were ascertained, the matter would not be settled, for it is contended that the narrative does not exhibit any connection between the famine which is known to have taken place in Judæa and the visit of Paul and Barnabas.

There has been much controversy regarding the date of the famine. Not a few scholars have inferred the date from the narrative of Luke, and have accordingly assigned it to 44. But this opinion

cannot be maintained. It is, at any rate, inconsistent with the statements of Josephus respecting the dearth in question. Even his assertions are not unambiguous. But from them it is clear that the famine cannot have been earlier than 45, perhaps not before 46, and may even have been as late as 47 (Ramsay, *Paul the Traveller*, adopts the date 47; Zahn, *Einleitung*, the date 47-48). If, then, Paul and Barnabas did not visit Jerusalem until the predicted famine actually took place, two years may possibly have elapsed between the deliverance of Peter and their visit. But this space of time seems excluded by the connection in which Luke relates the visit. He plainly believed that the visit was not far removed from the time of Peter's escape and of Herod's death. His language, indeed, is not absolutely opposed to the view that two years had passed, but the expression "about that time" certainly suggests a much shorter interval. This shorter interval, however, if adopted, dissolves the connection between the famine of which Josephus speaks and the visit of Paul and Barnabas. There is nothing, however, unreasonable in the conjecture that a scarcity may have shown itself in 44 or 45, and that the Church at Antioch, hearing of this, may have despatched Paul and Barnabas on their mission of philanthropy. Wholly to separate their mission from the predicted famine is impossible, but it is not necessary to connect the prediction with the particular year in which the famine prevailed in

Palestine. The language of Agabus referred to a great famine over all the world, and the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem may have been connected with a bad harvest preceding the actual dearth. On this view the visit of Paul and Barnabas may be brought into close relation with the death of James and the deliverance of Peter. At the same time it would be rash to conclude that the visit was paid at the very time when James had perished and when Peter's life was in peril. There is no evidence that they arrived during the Passover. Nor is this intrinsically probable. The omission of all mention of the Apostles, the silence of Paul in Galatians regarding this visit, and the circumstance that the gift was sent to the elders by Paul and Barnabas, do not warrant any such conclusion. All that can be said is that the Apostles may have been absent, but it certainly cannot be shown that they were. The probability that they were present must be equally acknowledged. Hence the description often given of the state of matters in Jerusalem when Paul and Barnabas arrived with the contribution from Antioch cannot be accepted.¹ It is not certain that they reached the capital after James had been executed, and when Peter had just made his escape. It is not certain that all the Apostles had fled, for there is no evidence to show that they did flee even when James was executed and Peter imprisoned. It is not certain that Paul and Barnabas

¹ Lightfoot, *Gal.* 126.

entered Jerusalem at the hazard of their lives, and that consequently they merely handed over the gift of the Church at Antioch to the elders and stole secretly away. The narrative of their visit does not expressly contradict such a view, but just as little lends it any countenance.

Moreover, the greater of the two probabilities is that the visit was paid after the death of Herod. If there was communication, as was doubtless the case, between Antioch and Jerusalem, and if the Church at Antioch had been informed of the death of James and of the arrest of Peter, would it not infer that a persecution was about to break out against the Church in Jerusalem which might lead to its members being scattered, as had happened a few years previously when Stephen fell? Would Paul and Barnabas not at such a time advise the Church to delay sending help until peace had again dawned? Besides, would Paul and Barnabas have judged it expedient to approach the capital at such a time?

The assumption, then, that the Apostles were absent from Jerusalem when Paul and Barnabas arrived, must not be made. Especially must this not be made in the case of James. He is expressly named as present in Jerusalem (Acts 12¹⁷) when Peter made his escape, and it may be taken for granted that he would remain in Jerusalem. So far as the evidence in our possession is concerned, there is every likelihood that James continued to reside in Jerusalem even after Peter's withdrawal.

But it is argued that Paul could not have omitted to mention this visit in the Epistle to the Galatians, had he seen any of the Apostles on this occasion. This is a dangerous argument to employ. It is a weapon which may be turned, as has often been done, against the occurrence of the visit itself. The presumption, as we have seen, is strong that James at least was in Jerusalem at the time, and Paul regarded James as an Apostle. Is it conceivable that Paul would have passed over a visit in which he had intercourse with James, though with none of the rest of the Apostles, if the mention of that visit had been germane to his purpose? If he almost goes out of his way to mention James the Lord's brother, though not one of the Twelve, as an Apostle whom he saw on the occasion of his first visit, is it credible that he would have failed to mention the second time at which he saw him, had his purpose been to specify the occasions on which he saw the Apostles, including James? The omission of all notice of the visit of Paul must be explained in quite another way. The visit is passed over not because all the Apostles were present or absent at the moment, but simply because his aim is not to enumerate his visits to Jerusalem, but to illustrate the nature of his relations with the Apostles. His account of his first visit showed his independence of them. That of his second visit would at most have confirmed the same fact. He therefore omits it, and passes on to the third visit, which not only proved his complete independence, but the full

and cordial recognition of that independence by the Apostles themselves, when his apostleship and teaching were directly challenged.

If a view of this visit which has been advocated (Ramsay, *Paul the Traveller*, 55) were correct, the stay of Paul and Barnabas must have been considerable, and their intercourse with James and the Apostles close and intimate. They must, it is asserted, have purchased corn and other food, and have personally superintended its distribution. Their visit probably extended over months. It cannot be said that the narrative of Acts suggests that Paul and Barnabas proceeded in this way. Nor is it easy to believe that they had the means at their command for doing so. The ordinary view, that they carried money with them and gave this to the elders, though condemned as irrational and incredible, is probably correct. Izates of Adiabene sent money to the relief of the capital at the same time,¹ and what he did the Christian community at Antioch may equally well have done. The usual view attributes, it is said, criminal incapacity to the Church at Antioch in sending gold to a starving city. But this accusation loses all point and value when it is known that the same criminal incapacity was shown by a sovereign, and is commended by Josephus. Paul and Barnabas, then, need not have spent much time in fulfilling the duty entrusted to them. Still they may have passed several days or weeks in the capital. However short their visit, it is

¹ Jos. *Antiq.* xx. ii. 5.

almost certain that Paul and James would meet. The circumstances bringing them together would be gratifying to both. It would be with unalloyed pleasure that James received the welcome gift as a fresh proof of union between the Churches of Jerusalem and of Antioch. The personal intercourse between them would doubtless serve to increase their mutual respect and confidence. The fuller their knowledge of one another, the greater would be their appreciation of one another's character and labours. James would have much to hear from Paul and Barnabas regarding the new Christian community at Antioch. The question of the conversion of the Gentiles could not have been altogether absent from his mind, and the account given by Paul and Barnabas of the entrance of the Gentiles within the Church may have drawn his attention to the Old Testament prophecies relating to their admission. Possibly, too, Paul and Barnabas gave him full information regarding the Christian worship and practices of the new community. He could not but learn that the rite of circumcision was not imposed on the Gentile converts. They in their turn would hear from James of the persecution from which the Christians had suffered, and also of the unpopularity with which they had come to be regarded. The favour which the Christian Church had formerly enjoyed in the capital was now at an end.

It has frequently been assumed that the relations between the Churches of Jerusalem and of Antioch

must have been altered by the bestowal and acceptance of help at this time. The poverty and dependence of the Church of the capital would lead it to think less highly of its original prerogatives, while the Church of Antioch in turn would have its independence fostered and strengthened by the fact that it ministered to the needs of the Church of the capital. It may, however, be doubted whether this interpretation of the relations between the Churches is admissible. The supposition may be made that the Church at Jerusalem regarded the gift from Antioch as an act of homage or as but the repayment of an obligation. Much the best course, however, is to acknowledge our ignorance of the effect produced by the bestowal and acceptance of the gift except in so far as it contributed to bind the Christians of both Churches together, and served as a symbol of their unity and love. At any rate, the inference must not be drawn that from this date the supremacy of Jerusalem as the mother Church of Christendom ceased, and that the sceptre of authority was transferred to Antioch. For this plainly is not the view of the New Testament. Jerusalem so long as it existed was in the estimation of all Christians the Metropolis of Christianity. It ceased to be such only when the doom so long predicted overtook it.

CHAPTER V.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

THE sources of the life of James are scanty. By far the most valuable of these is the Epistle which bears his name. Its genuineness has been called in question, but improperly. The evidence in its favour, alike internal and external, is more than adequate to convince any reasonable man. The scepticism which would reject the Epistle is a scepticism which if consistent would reject nearly all the writings of antiquity.

The date of the letter cannot be determined with accuracy, but the balance of probability leans towards the view that it was written before the Congress of Jerusalem. A few eminent scholars assign it to a later period, but for some years the opinion which ascribes it to a date before the Congress has commanded the support of a great and increasing number of adherents. If this opinion be correct, it may be assigned to the years 47 to 50. A date shortly before the Convention is the most suitable, as time is thus given for the establishment and growth of the Churches referred to in the letter.

According to Acts, James in or about the year 44

occupied a conspicuous place in the Church of Jerusalem. He is the only person whom Peter mentions by name to whom he wished the news of his escape to be told (Acts xii.). The Epistle, written not long after the withdrawal of Peter from Jerusalem and the visit of Paul and Barnabas, confirms the testimony of Acts. The writer is content to designate himself simply as "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." He does not specify his father's name, he does not disclose his rank or dignity if he had any, nor does he offer any excuse or assign any reason for the step he takes. Now as the name James was as common among the Jews as John and William among ourselves, the writer must have been aware that he could not possibly have been mistaken for any other person; and thus plainly indicates the position which he held within the Church. This view is strengthened by the consideration that the letter, if the date assigned to it be correct, is the earliest of all the New Testament Epistles. Only a person whose authority was unquestioned would have ventured to be the first to direct a letter to Christian communities. The communities addressed may possibly have comprised the entire Christian Church beyond the Holy Land. The address should most probably be understood of Jewish Christians only, but Jewish Christians at this time must have formed the vast majority of Christians.

Further, the tone of the writer has the accent of authority. He writes, indeed, as a Christian brother,

but his words are those of one evidently accustomed to be heard and obeyed. His title to exhort and rebuke is indisputable. No one of his readers is free to challenge it.

The absence of any reference to the Apostles is also significant in this connection. Had he not regarded himself as on an equality with them, had his right to speak not been as great as theirs, he could hardly have passed them unnoticed. All these facts testify that the eminence of James had obtained the widest recognition, and that his name was held in the highest respect throughout the Church.

So much, then, for his position as revealed by the letter. What information, now, does it furnish with regard to his intellectual endowments and attainments, and to his views concerning the relation of Christianity and Judaism?

It is impossible to read the letter without recognising its intensely practical character. The interests of the writer lie in conduct, not in speculation. The famous paragraph on Faith and Works is a striking illustration in point. Here his aim is not the assertion of a doctrine, but insistence on right conduct. Had the mind of James been of a less practical bent, had he been more of a thinker or logician, the connection between the different portions of the letter would have been closer, and it would have presented fewer difficulties of interpretation to the reader. A careful reasoner would not have left it uncertain whether it is the rich Christian or the rich man who is to exult

in his humiliation. He would also have pointed out the different senses of such terms as 'temptation' and 'faith.' He would not have referred to Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac as an instance of justification by works, and supported it by a quotation which suggests that he was justified by faith. Nor would he have left it doubtful whether the rich persons referred to in the letter, and more particularly the landowners who oppress and rob their labourers, belong to the Christian community or not. There is no evidence in the letter that the author was bred at a college or university. The diction, the forms of expression, the modes of treatment are unfavourable to such a view. The Epistle is plainly the work of a strong and energetic mind full of moral fervour, but unversed in the intellectual habits and language of the scholars of his age.

The Greek of the Epistle is distinguished among the writings of the New Testament by its comparative purity. It approaches more nearly the classical standard than any other book, the Epistle to the Hebrews excepted. At the same time it is obviously the work of one to whom Greek is a foreign tongue, and whose ideas are cast in a Semitic mould. The writer possesses a sound practical acquaintance with the constructions and vocabulary of the language, but he does not use its resources with the skill and ease of a native. Considered as a specimen of Greek prose, the Epistle is more remarkable for the absence of solecisms and blemishes than for its positive merits. The copiousness, the subtlety, the harmonious

and balanced clauses, the orderly and symmetrical structure of the Greek period, are wanting. There are few sentences of any length, and even these are monotonous in character and defective in form. The particles are sparingly used. The distinctively Greek constructions do not appear. Although instances of Greek idioms can be pointed out, clauses and sentences are found which no native Greek would have written. Not only is the Hebraic tone of thought manifest, but even distinct Hebraisms occur.

The vocabulary of the Epistle has often excited surprise, and has indeed been pronounced to be beyond the capacity of the brother of our Lord. Its variety and richness are alleged to betoken a degree of culture such as he cannot have possessed. But many of the judgments passed upon the vocabulary are hasty, and betray an imperfect acquaintance with the history of the Greek tongue. That not a few words are used by James for the first time, so far as our knowledge extends, and that he employs words not found in the LXX or the New Testament, cannot be questioned; but that his diction is that of philosophy and not that of common speech cannot be proved. On the contrary, the most recent additions to our knowledge show that the Greek of the Epistle is the Greek of popular speech. How improbable it is that James would venture to form words in a tongue not his own! It is quite possible that future discoveries of inscriptions and books may teach us that no one of the thirteen words, found as yet in James only, was absent from the

popular language. Nor is there any phrase or expression in the Epistle that can be shown to be purely literary or philosophical, and as such outside the range of the vocabulary of James. The supposed hexameter (1¹⁷), the illustration of the mirror (1²³), the parallel between knowledge and action (1²³) and speech and action (3¹), the figures of the bit in the horses' mouths (3⁴), of the vessels and their rudders and of the wheel of birth (3⁶), betray no acquaintance with the Græco-Roman world of ideas (Von Soden, *Handcom.* i. 60). Will it be said that James deliberately composed a hexameter line? Is the contrast between knowing or speaking and doing peculiar to Greek or Roman experience? Can no example of these and similar expressions be quoted from the Gospels, the New Testament and Jewish literature? Were not the figures in question as familiar to a Jew as to a Greek or Roman?

The character of the Greek of the Epistle has often been urged against its genuineness, but, as the letter is obviously the work of a Greek-speaking Jew, there is no reason why it should not have been composed by James, unless it can be shown that the acquaintance with Greek which it exhibits could not have been attained by him. But no evidence to this effect can be produced. It is easy to assert that an ordinary Jew of Galilee could not have possessed the knowledge of Greek which appears in his letter. Aramaic was the vernacular of James, and he spoke this tongue at home and amongst his intimate friends.

But Greek as a spoken tongue was also familiar to him. Galilee was practically bilingual, and he could not travel for many miles in any direction from Nazareth without hearing Greek spoken, and without encountering persons who knew no other language. Whether Joseph his father knew Greek is uncertain, though the flight into Egypt renders it not improbable; but that it was known to the household is credible because of the evident acquaintance of our Lord as well as James with it. It is possible that Greek was spoken in Nazareth itself; and if it be true that Nazareth was not the secluded spot which it is commonly regarded as having been, but, on the contrary, a centre of active life, this possibility becomes almost a certainty. A special reason for the acquisition of Greek would be the desire to buy and read portions of the LXX which were readily accessible and comparatively cheap. In a household like that of Joseph and Mary such a consideration may have had no little influence.

It can hardly, then, be doubted that James was able to read and speak Greek before his conversion. After that date his position as one of the leading members of the new community would render the knowledge of Greek indispensable. It would seem as if the majority of the three thousand converts added to the Church at Pentecost spoke the Greek tongue, and intimate social intercourse with them was possible only to one conversant with Greek. There is no reason to believe that James was not able to speak readily with them.

Peter was evidently able to speak and write Greek ; and what Peter was able to do, there is no ground for believing that James was unable to do. Further, in his later years the intercourse with Jews from foreign lands visiting the capital would be carried on chiefly in Greek, and it is even possible that Greek as well as Aramaic was employed in the service of the Church of Jerusalem. The LXX was the Bible of the Church from the first, and even where the service was Aramaic there would doubtless be reference to the LXX.

To pass from the language of the letter to its contents. What testimony is borne by these to the culture of James ? Is it possible to point out direct literary obligations on his part ? Can we draw sound inferences as to the books which influenced him ?

No little industry has been expended by a number of scholars in collecting from Jewish and Greek literature thoughts and phrases similar to those occurring in the letter. This labour is not thrown away, for it is often instructive to compare the different ways in which like thoughts are expressed. But some scholars have not been content to bring forward similar ideas and language, in order to illustrate the Epistle. They contend that the resemblances which they point out prove that James had read the books in which these are found. It is true that they would repudiate the opinion that all instances of resemblance are cases of literary indebtedness, for such a proposition is obviously false. Nevertheless they seem to be unconsciously influenced by this

principle ; otherwise it is hard to understand why they argue as they do. To read certain essays and papers bearing on the relation of the Epistle to other writings, is to discover that James in composing it must have had his mind saturated with scores of books. The Epistle, according to this representation, is a mosaic made up of thoughts and phrases from all quarters. It is the product of a most retentive and flexible memory. Expressions scattered over many pages in the same or different writings are brought together by James and placed in new combinations. Now the slightest examination shows that the Epistle cannot have been produced in this way. It is no literary patchwork ; the thoughts and words belong to the author and not to other writers ; he no more reproduces the ideas and views of other men than Paul himself.

There is no reason to suppose that James had read widely, nor does the letter suggest that he had. His knowledge of the Old Testament is obvious. He not only refers to persons and incidents mentioned in it, but also quotes it. His citations are taken from the Septuagint, which was probably the version of Scripture with which he was most familiar. It is not clear from the Epistle whether he was acquainted with the Old Testament in Hebrew, though one or two expressions render this view not improbable.

It has been often held that the Epistle exhibits a close acquaintance with Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. That affinities between these

writings and the Epistle exist is undeniable; but whether these are such as to be proofs of dependence is not so plain as is often assumed. It is doubtful whether the resemblances to the Wisdom of Solomon imply that James was indebted to that work, and even his familiarity with the work of the Son of Sirach is by no means so striking or certain as is often asserted. The attempts that have been made to prove that he was acquainted with many of the writings of Philo, and also directly or indirectly with the writings of Greek philosophers, must be pronounced unsuccessful. It is, of course, possible that he had read some of Philo's works, but the instances produced do not support this conclusion. Besides, it is not probable that the speculations of Philo would have any interest for a mind like that of James. Still less credible is the opinion that he was conversant with Greek thought. The literature of Greek philosophy lay beyond his horizon, and it is doubtful whether, even had it been accessible, he would have made the slightest use of it.

The literary influence, if we may so speak, most clearly traceable in the Epistle is that of our Lord Himself. It is true that His words are never quoted as such; but His characteristic modes of thought and language are reproduced in the Epistle—reproduced, not imitated, for the ideas and words are plainly the writer's own. It is impossible to read the Epistle carefully without being constantly

reminded of sayings of our Lord, and especially of the Sermon on the Mount. James was doubtless familiar with our Lord's words as handed down by tradition, but he must also have heard many of them himself. What he had heard and what he had received by tradition were united in his memory and became an essential part of his spiritual treasures. If it is true that he breathes the spirit and language of the Old Testament, it is still more true that he breathes the spirit and language of our Lord.

It is important in this connection to examine his views touching the relationship of Judaism and Christianity. What was his attitude towards the Law? Nothing is more characteristic of his letter than the absence of any reference to the fundamental rite of the Law—circumcision. He is equally silent respecting the Sabbath, the festivals, the laws of food, and the stated fasts. He describes the true service of God as consisting in benevolence and moral purity. What is the significance of these facts? Do they not prove that the zeal for the Law so commonly attributed to him is a delusion? Why does the great champion of the Law leave its central rite unmentioned? Why has he nothing to say regarding those practices which in the eyes of every orthodox Jew entered into the very essence of the religious life? James doubtless kept the Law as the other Christians in Jerusalem did; but his Epistle is inconsistent with the view that he attached any special importance to its rites and

ceremonies. Had these usages been of any consequence in his eyes, had they stood in any vital relation to Christian duty, he could not any more than the Son of Sirach have passed them by. Nothing is plainer than that the Law in its ritual and ceremonial portions had ceased to be of importance to him. He had mastered our Lord's teaching on the subject. Our Lord had put circumcision aside as morally indifferent; its purpose had been realised, its spiritual equivalent bestowed upon men, and its observance was therefore no longer a matter of conscience. As it had found no place in the teaching of our Lord, so it finds no place in the teaching of James. What was true of the most distinctive feature of the Law applied still more to its other rites and practices. The silence of James regarding circumcision, the Sabbath, and the laws of meats, demonstrates that he was no more a legalist than our Lord Himself. The attitude of James towards the ritual and ceremonial Law is substantially identical with that of our Lord.

The Law, indeed, he held in the highest honour. It was to him the expression of the will of God and the standard of human duty. A man's attitude towards it should be that of a doer and not of a critic (4¹¹). The Law is a unity—a whole made up of many parts; to transgress it in one respect is to transgress it in all. The Ten Commandments form part of the Law. The Law is described as

perfect (1²⁵), as a Law of liberty (1²⁵ 2¹²), and there is also a Law which is called royal.

What is the Law which James thus depicts? Is it the Law as contained in the Old Testament? That the Old Testament was authoritative with James is plain; but that he was thinking exclusively of the Law as given in the Old Testament cannot be maintained. The Old Testament was to him the revelation of the will of God, but it was not the final revelation of that will. That will was revealed in Jesus, and the Law as interpreted and promulgated by Jesus was the Law binding upon men. James speaks of the Law as perfect. This language suggests a comparison with a Law which is imperfect. The contrast before him was between the Law as he had originally known it and the Law as conceived and expounded by our Lord. The Law given by Moses was imperfect; the Law given by Jesus was perfect. The Law as understood by James is the Law as understood by Jesus, for its standard is the character of God, moral perfection, love to God and man.

Not only is the Law perfect, it is also the Law of liberty. James seems to hold apart the ideas of perfection and liberty, the former referring to the contents of the Law, the latter to its spirit. Not only is the Law perfect, it also creates spiritual freedom, establishing an abiding union between the command of God and the human will. The command enjoined becomes an inward principle. The Law is

written on the heart and therefore embodied in the life. The expression "law of liberty" is used on one occasion by James to enhance the sense of responsibility. At the first glance the two ideas seem incompatible; yet on reflection it is not difficult to perceive how the law of freedom adds to our accountability. The Christian has not only received a fuller revelation of what God requires of him than others, but also fuller power to comply with what is demanded. Responsibility is in proportion to knowledge and ability; hence the moral responsibility of the Christian is greater than that of other men.

Would the phrase the "law of liberty" have been applied by James to designate the Law of Moses? This is possible but improbable, in view of his use of the epithet perfect. Both expressions are intended to set forth two features or aspects of the Law as conceived by the writer, and hence the characteristic freedom is opposed to the characteristic servitude. Experience may have taught James that a merely external command engenders a servile spirit. The obedience which it requires, if rendered at all, is rendered in a hostile temper, and in the great majority of instances is not rendered. The man is enslaved because he bears an alien yoke. Possibly the contrast most in the mind of James was that between the Law as expounded by the scribes, consisting in multitudinous external rites, and the spiritual legislation of our Lord. He may, however, at the same time

have had before him the difference between a commandment which merely enjoins and a commandment which empowers as well as enjoins. The yoke of the Law of Moses was slavery; the yoke of the Law of Jesus, liberty.

James distinguishes the commandment of love by the epithet 'royal.' He has evidently in view not the Law as a whole, to which such an epithet is hardly appropriate, but only one of its special commands. But why is the law of love so designated? Of the many explanations that have been given, that which sees in it the highest and most authoritative of all the commandments is the most satisfactory. The command to love may well be termed 'royal' because it possesses authority over all others, and because it constitutes the essential spirit of each. The view that the command is called 'royal' because it is addressed by a king to his subjects is inadequate, because this is true of all commands, and the opinion that the command is addressed to those who are in the position of kings seems irrelevant.

The silence of the letter on the subject of circumcision, the Sabbath, and other Jewish rites, appears the more remarkable when it is remembered that there were Gentile Christians in some at least of the Churches addressed. Antioch was almost certainly one of these Churches, and the origin of Christianity there can hardly be put later than 38. At the time, then, when the letter was written the Gentile Christians at Antioch were received on terms of

equality by their Jewish fellow-Christians. No restriction of any kind was placed upon them. They sat side by side with their Jewish fellow-believers at the Feast of Love and at the Lord's Supper. This freedom of intercourse implies that Jews at Antioch had ceased to observe the Law as interpreted in Palestine. Their association with men who were uncircumcised and who did not observe the laws relating to foods was pollution in the eyes of a rigid Jew; for it was this very association which the Law was meant to prevent. James must have been perfectly familiar with the conduct of the Christian community at Antioch. Did he then approve of what was done? His silence can bear no other meaning. Had he been opposed to the freedom of intercourse between the two branches of the Church, he would have felt it necessary to say so. If he had believed that Christian Jews were bound to abstain from religious and still more from social intercourse with Gentiles, even though these Gentiles were Christians, he could hardly have failed to state and enforce this duty. He could not possibly have tolerated so gross a breach of the Law. It must therefore be concluded that James like Peter had learned the lesson taught by the conversion of Cornelius, and that he did not regard the Law as binding on the Christian Jews at Antioch.

The members of the communities addressed are described as assembling for worship in the 'Synagogue.' The term probably denotes a place of worship. The

scene depicted by James in the second chapter suggests that he has a building in his mind. This building could not have been an ordinary Jewish synagogue, for it is inconceivable that Christian worship would have been tolerated there, and, besides, the phrase 'your synagogue' shows that the edifice belonged to the Christians. But the building need not have been a place entirely devoted to religious worship. A room used for service fulfils all the requirements of the case.

The fact here implied, that Christians met by themselves for worship, is attested by the narrative of Acts, and is indeed self-evident. The existence and development of Christianity depended upon its having a worship of its own from the first. How otherwise could Christians know, encourage, and strengthen one another? The assertion has often been made, that the Christians of Jewish birth, whether within or beyond the Holy Land, had no worship and no organisation distinct from those of their Jewish fellow-countrymen; but this statement is contradicted by all our authorities, which point to a separate worship, with the organisation it involved, as contemporary with Christianity itself. The Christian was always more than an ordinary Jew. If he frequented the Jewish synagogue, he frequented still more the Christian synagogue, and he may soon have confined himself to attendance on worship there. By so doing he did not seem to cut himself off in the least from his nation. He was still a Jew, his worship was

still Jewish because Christian. What worship could be so distinctively and purely Jewish as the worship of the Messiah? The Christian Jew was indeed conscious that he differed from his unbelieving fellow-countrymen, and that this difference was expressed in his worship. But the difference was not hostility. Christianity was Judaism as God meant it to be: Judaism perfected, realised in the person, teaching, and life of the Messiah. It was his expectation that other Jews would come to think and act like himself, and recognise in Jesus the Messiah and in Christianity the completion of Judaism.

The worship of the Jewish synagogue was open to all. Anyone could enter who would, and so was it with the Christian synagogue. This circumstance adds force to the suggestion that the Jewish Christians regarded their own religious service as equivalent to that of the synagogue, and wherever they existed in any numbers formed a synagogue by themselves. A vivid picture is sketched in the letter of the treatment meted out to the rich compared with the poor visitor. The brilliant dress of the wealthy man attracts every eye, and he is eagerly invited to occupy one of the best seats; while the mean clothing of the poor man receives only a passing glance, and he is bidden to stand or is given one of the inferior seats.

The social rank of the vast majority of the members addressed admits of no doubt. They belonged to the poor. It has even been asserted that they consisted of the poor exclusively, and it

must be granted that some obscurity rests on the point whether any rich men were found among them. The manner in which James writes leaves it open to question whether he regarded any of the rich as Christians, but a careful examination of his language favours the view that some persons of substance belonged to the communities addressed. James refers to the rich on three occasions. On the first of these, while exhorting the brother of low degree to glory in his exaltation, he exhorts the rich to glory in his humiliation (1⁹). Here it is not plain whether the rich man is or is not a Christian, but most probably he is. A reading which is possibly the original ('the brother'), the most natural sense of the words, and general likelihood, tell in favour of this view. Against it is the consideration that the rich Christian and not merely the rich man is described as passing away. But a reader has no difficulty in supplying the obvious qualification,—in his capacity as rich man,—while on the opposite view he can find no motive for the announcement of the lot of the rich man, nor for the irony, however grave, in which the announcement is made. The course of thought and the form of expression, to say nothing of the difficulties intrinsic to the contrary opinion, decide that the duty of the poor Christian and of the rich Christian respectively is here set forth. This conclusion is strengthened by the reflection that it is improbable that none but the poor should have joined any of the Churches of the Dispersion. Why

should not men of the social rank of Barnabas have been found among them?

The second place in which the rich appear as possible members of the community is that in which the conduct of those merchants is censured who take their tenure of life for granted, forgetting that life depends at every moment on the will of God (4¹³). The tone in which these are rebuked, the directions given them, the inference drawn,—all point to Christians, and more than compensate for the absence of the title 'brethren' and of any direct summons to repentance.

It is otherwise with the third passage (5¹), though it too has often been understood of Christians. Its position immediately following a section addressed to Christians, and the use of the same exclamation in both sections, are arguments of no little weight in favour of the view that Christians are here spoken of. But the opposing considerations are still stronger. The temper and language of the passage are those of judgment: there is no exhortation to penitence: no appeal to Christian motives: no gleam of hope, and it is therefore impossible that James and the rich whom he denounces could have borne equally the Christian name. Besides, is it conceivable that rich men guilty of the conduct here described could have joined the Christian Church? What motives could have induced them to do so? Self-interest? Vanity? Fear of judgment? Finally, the employment of the term 'brethren' (5⁷) seems to prove that the rich persons dealt with were not members of the Christian Church.

The result of this discussion is that while the great majority of the twelve tribes in the Dispersion were poor, some of them were in circumstances entitling them to be called rich. For wealth, it must not be forgotten, is a comparative term; and what in the eyes of James might be wealth might not appear such to some of his fellow-countrymen. His standard of wealth would be that of the poor man rather than the rich, and therefore be much lower.

That the rich as a class stood outside of the Church is clear. James speaks of one of them as drawn by curiosity to visit a place of Christian worship (2^d), and in this connection condemns the practice of paying respect to the rich and of disregarding the poor or treating them with contempt. He describes the rich as oppressing the readers, dragging them before the courts, and as blaspheming the noble name which had been named upon them. Such blasphemy was impossible for a Christian, and therefore the rich spoken of cannot have been Christians. They may have been unbelieving Gentiles or Jews, for it is conceivable that the conduct described might have proceeded from men of either race. The Churches of the Dispersion were, as a rule, in the midst both of Gentiles and Jews, and the harsh treatment spoken of might be due to the action of one or other of these classes. But the choice between them is not difficult. The tribunals mentioned cannot have been Gentile courts, for Christianity did not lie under public or official condemnation till Nero charged

the Christians with setting fire to the capital. Up to that date, as far as our knowledge extends, the Christians were rather protected than punished by Gentile judges. The courts referred to must accordingly be Jewish courts. Besides, how strange a designation the term 'rich' would be for Gentile judges or prosecutors. That the prosecutors were Jews, follows also from the statement that they blasphemed the name by which Christians were called. A charge of this kind could be made against rich Jews only. Nothing was more likely than that these should speak scornfully of Jesus, the pretended Messiah of the new and accursed sect of the Nazarenes, who had paid on the Cross the just penalty of his insolence and vanity. But what possible interest had the rich Gentiles in the claims of Jesus? What likelihood is there that they had heard of His name, or that, having heard of it, they would have felt even the most languid curiosity respecting His labours? What could possibly have roused them to blaspheme? Again, it is improbable that Jewish Christians would be exposed to persecution chiefly, if not exclusively, at the hands of rich Gentiles. What motives could the rich have for attacking them? The Christians were poor, they lived among the poor, their tenets and practices would give most offence to the poor. The rich were ignorant of them, or, if they knew, despised them. Why then should the rich and not the poor have become their persecutors? On the contrary, such action on the part of their

wealthy fellow-countrymen can be readily understood. Only, in fact, on the supposition that the rich oppressors were Jews who did not believe, are the circumstances of the Christians as described in the letter readily comprehended. The Christians reap their fields and depend on them for their daily bread: but the rich keep back their wages, and at the same time are themselves plunged in luxury. They are familiar with the doctrine of the Parousia in the last days (5³) and with the title 'Lord of Sabaoth' (5⁴). They are able to drag the poor before the courts. This can refer only to trials before the Synagogue courts, for in these it was easy for the rich Jews to oppress the Christians, as the members of these courts were largely men of the same station and sentiments as themselves.

It may be asked whether such exercise of power on the part of the rich Jews over their fellow-countrymen is conceivable among the Jews of the Dispersion. Would such conduct have been tolerated in lands where the Sanhedrin possessed no jurisdiction, and where the Jews themselves were often the object of popular hatred? Our knowledge of Christianity in the Dispersion hardly permits us to answer these questions fully and precisely, but as regards the possibility of the line of action here mentioned there can be no doubt, in view of the commission to Damascus which Paul received from the high priest. Damascus lay outside Palestine. The high priest had no jurisdiction there, yet it was possible for him to

have Christians brought all the way to Jerusalem in order to be tried and punished for the tenets they held. This was possible, because the Christians in Damascus were still socially one with their Jewish fellow-countrymen, and so amenable to the authority of the Jewish courts. The power of these over the Jews was extensive even in Gentile cities, and it is probable that the condition of affairs described by James lasted till the proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles resulted in the formation of mixed Churches and in the separation of Jewish Christians from the Jews.

An attempt has been made to identify the poor spoken of in the Epistle with a special class of Jewish men and women: the peaceful in the land, the meek, instances of whose character and opinions may be found in the Simeon and Anna of the Gospel of Luke. The opposition between wealth and poverty was also one of religion. The poor received, the rich rejected the gospel. But no connection can be established between the peaceful in the land and the Christians. There is no proof that this class became Christian to a greater extent than any other. Besides, there is no reason to believe that either in the Epistle or in the New Testament in general is poverty or wealth to be understood in other than its usual meaning. The poor as such are never the good, nor the rich as such the bad. If the poor are more susceptible to the message of the gospel, it is only because their condition enables them to appreciate its promises more

and to obey its precepts better than is the case with the rich.

To explain the hostility of the rich Jews to the Christians is not difficult. At the time when James wrote, riches were commonly associated in the eyes of the Jews with rank and culture. The Sadducees filled the highest offices of the priesthood, and were distinguished for wealth and luxury, and there were Pharisees who were scarcely inferior to them in this respect. To James the Sadducees and the Pharisees were rich, and, as is plain from Acts, they were one in their hostility to the Christian faith. That faith struck at the self-indulgent life of the one class and at the self-conceit and the false sanctity of the other, and at the love of pleasure and power common to both. The teaching of Jesus concerning riches was profoundly distasteful to both these classes, and seemed to portend a social revolution. Twice had He given offence to the hierarchy by His expulsion of the traders from the Temple and by His denunciation of the unholy traffic from which the chief priests derived so much of their income. Not less scathing was His condemnation of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. Both classes accordingly joined in procuring His death, and to both the success of the new faith was disquieting and hateful. The sentiments which governed the minds of the leading men in Jerusalem spread readily to those of the same class in the Dispersion. Inter-course between them was frequent, and their interests were the same. Hence Christianity soon became as

unpopular among the Jews in the Dispersion as it was in its native land, and the same scenes were witnessed there which occurred in Palestine. It has been assumed that the description of the luxury, the rapacity, and the violence culminating in bloodshed, of the rich, was drawn from what passed before the eyes of James in Palestine. But it is most unlikely that James transferred what he had seen in Jerusalem to foreign lands. Such a literary artifice was foreign to his nature. He described what he had heard with his own ears, if not seen with his own eyes. His communications with the Churches of the Dispersion were probably numerous, and he would be kept fully informed regarding their state and prospects.

The Christians worshipping in the synagogue were presided over by a body of elders (5¹⁴). It would seem that such elders existed in each of the Churches addressed, for the writer is evidently dealing with an instance that might occur anywhere. The elders to whom he refers are not the elders of one definite community, but of any community in which a sick person might be found.

The only duty which the Epistle mentions as discharged by the elders is that of praying for and anointing with oil a sick member with a view to his recovery. The sufferer is directed to call for the elders in order that they may so act. He is to send not for one or several elders, but for the entire presbyterate. The reason for this step was doubtless their representative character, the Church being as it

were embodied in them. Their intercession was the intercession of the congregation over which they presided. The prescription to anoint with oil may have been due to the efficacy which oil was believed to possess or may with equal likelihood be traced back to the action of the twelve Apostles when sent out as evangelists. The Twelve anointed the diseased with oil possibly in accordance with instructions given by our Lord, though this is not stated (Mk 6¹³). If this were so, the injunction of James to anoint in the name of the Lord can be taken in the strictest sense as denoting an act done in obedience to the command of Jesus. James speaks as if the patient on whose behalf such action was taken was certain to recover. He regarded the combined prayer and anointing as working together and effecting a cure. The element of faith was doubtless in the judgment of James the more important agency; but it is erroneous to ascribe no virtue whatever to the process of anointing. James, at any rate, held that process to be an integral factor in the restoration of the sufferer. It should be observed that the language of James does not imply that the power of healing was confined to the elders, belonging to them in virtue of their office. He would have allowed that the same results could have been wrought with the same means by ordinary members of the community. The elders are especially mentioned because they were the men of strongest faith and ripest experience in the congregation.

If God were to heal at all, it would be through their agency.

It does not follow, however, though the only function ascribed to the elders in the letter is to pray and anoint the sick, that this was their sole duty. Nothing implies that they existed merely for the purpose named. It is altogether unlikely that a special body of men would have been called into existence to discharge such a duty only. Much more tenable is the view that the elders were the moral directors of the community.

The incidental manner in which the elders are spoken of shows that the institution was well known. It must have existed for some time among the Churches of the Dispersion. Whence, then, was it derived? There can scarcely be any doubt that it was taken from the similar institution in Palestine with which every Jew was familiar. In most communities there, the management of civil and religious affairs was in the hands of a body of elders. The Jews residing outside of the Holy Land carried the institution with them, modifying it as far as necessary to suit their new circumstances.

The Christian Jews within and without Palestine proceeded, it would seem, in exactly the same way, entrusting the management of their interests to a small body of their own number known as elders. The duties of Christian elders in the Dispersion must have differed not a little from the duties of the elders of the synagogue; but this arose simply

from the difference between the Synagogue and the Church.

It has often been asserted of late that the elders were not a definite body of men wielding jurisdiction, but simply the most eminent members of the community. The elders in the Epistle of James, it is urged, possessed no title to rule or to teach. But this inference is hasty. It cannot be shown that the elders were simply the Christians most distinguished for their faith and zeal. Every Christian possessing high spiritual qualifications was not as such an elder. Women were not elders, however great their spiritual gifts; and there were doubtless many Christians eminent for the purity of their lives and their capacity for service who were not elders. Nor can it be shown that the elders were not the rulers of the community. May they not have administered the Jewish law as understood among themselves? They dealt with all violations of that law, and doubtless also settled any disputes that might arise between the different members of the community. The elders then spoken of by James were like the elders elsewhere, the authorities of the community.

The origin of the eldership probably dates back almost to the origin of the Church itself. There were elders, as we have seen, in the Church of Jerusalem in 44, and it is highly probable that they existed in the Church from the first, or that they were appointed at a very early period in its

history, and not later than the time when Stephen perished. The existence of the institution in the Churches of the Dispersion between 46 and 50 confirms this view. The Christian Churches there doubtless framed their organisation on the model of the Churches of Jerusalem and of the Holy Land; and Paul and Barnabas, when on their first missionary journey they ordained elders in every Christian community (Acts 14), were doubtless setting up an institution with which they had been familiar for years in Jerusalem and in Antioch.

It is not known how the elders were chosen to office, and whether their appointment was for life or for a term of years. The highest authorities on Jewish history are divided in opinion as to the manner in which the elders of the Synagogue were elected. It is held by some that they were chosen by a popular vote; by others, that they were chosen by those already in office. There is nothing to show how the elders spoken of by James were appointed; but analogy favours the view that they were the choice of the community. All through the early history of the Church the principle of popular election appears. This principle was perhaps acted on even by Timothy and by Titus in making the appointments entrusted to them. The testimony of the First Epistle of Clement and of the *Teaching of the Apostles* shows clearly that the community was in the habit of electing its office-bearers.

The language used in the Epistle regarding the elders shows the separateness of the Christian from the Jewish assembly. The elders are designated elders of the Church, doubtless in contra-distinction to Jewish elders. This proves that the congregation referred to had assumed an independent form. Christian elders were not required, and could have had no place in the synagogue. Their only possible sphere was within the Christian Church. It will be noticed that James speaks of the elders of the Church and not of the synagogue, and the use of the one term rather than the other can hardly be regarded as accidental. Whence then his selection of 'Church'? Having used the word 'synagogue' to denote the place of meeting, he would desire to avail himself of another term to designate Christians as a body, and none so suitable offered itself as 'Church.' The word would have a special fitness in his eyes if he knew, as he probably did, that it was applied by our Lord Himself to denote the institution or corporation He had come to set up.

In the communities to which James wrote, it was open to anyone to come forward as a teacher. This shows that the teachers were not a fixed number of men chosen for this particular duty. They may have constituted a distinct class, but the extent of the class was limited only by the decision of the individual. James deprecates the assumption of this office, because the responsibility

of the teacher is greater than that of the ordinary member. Hence it would appear as if teaching was not regarded by him as a spiritual gift, but as a function which a man might exercise at his pleasure, and the fulfilment of which needed to be discouraged. The Jewish Christian churches allowed an even greater freedom of teaching than was permitted in the synagogue, and on this account many had put themselves forward as teachers rashly and unwisely.

The Epistle, though addressed to the Twelve Tribes of the Dispersion, must have been intended for a definite circle of readers, as is shown by the local and specific character of many of its references. The uniformity in the condition of the readers indicates that they lived under similar circumstances, and possibly in the same or adjoining districts. It is presupposed that the elders are members of certain Christian congregations, and the letter accordingly must have been despatched by a messenger or messengers to different churches outside the Holy Land. But where, it may be asked, could such Churches be found before the close of the fifth decade of the first century, and only twenty years after the Crucifixion? Every land and every sea was, in the language of the Sibyl, full of Jews. The great cities of the world teemed with them; their genius for trade, notwithstanding their strong national instincts, scattering them over the face of the globe. Wherever Jews were to be found, there also Christian Jews

might be found. The crowd that heard the memorable address of Peter at Pentecost was made up of Jews from all parts of the world, and some of them may have believed in Jesus as the Messiah, and sought to spread their convictions on their return home. But it is hardly credible that communities of Jewish Christians had been formed in lands far distant from Palestine at so early a date. Organised Churches such as those addressed by James, which had evidently existed for some years, must naturally be placed in the neighbourhood of the Holy Land. It can neither be affirmed nor denied, with adequate certainty, that there were Christian Churches in Alexandria or Rome at the time, but there can be little doubt that the Churches James had specially in his view were those of Syria and Phœnicia. The existence of Churches in these provinces at the date named is certain. Syria contained a larger number of Jews than any other province. They were numerous in Antioch its capital, and there and in Damascus, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles. Christian congregations arose soon after the death of Stephen. From the same source we hear of the existence of Christian Churches in Phœnicia (Ac 15³). The Jewish communities in these lands doubtless enjoyed equal privileges with their fellow-countrymen elsewhere, and would be at liberty to send contributions to the Temple and to exercise jurisdiction over their members. Jewish law made no distinction between civil and criminal offences, and

nothing was so abhorrent to a Jew as to be subject to any authority save that of his own sacred Law, and to the courts in which it was administered. The oppression of the Christian poor by the rich, the withholding of their wages, the dragging them before courts, correspond exactly with what we know regarding the internal relations to one another of the Jews of the Dispersion. That Jewish Christians living outside of Palestine were amenable to the authority of Jewish tribunals is proved superabundantly by Paul's five scourgings (2 Co 3⁴). The thirty-nine lashes which he received each of these times were inflicted solely because of his profession of Christianity.

Nothing is said in the Epistle concerning the relations of the different Churches addressed to one another and to the Church of Jerusalem. That they were connected in some way is certain, for they all recognised one another as Christians and acknowledged the authority of James. It has been conjectured that they were colonies, so to speak, of the Church of Jerusalem, and that, as such, they regarded themselves as subject to its authority. It has even been supposed that their elders had been ordained to office by the Apostles themselves or by delegates from them. Such may have been the history of the Churches. On the other hand, they may have possessed no formal unity, and been bound together by no tie except their common faith. It is, to say the least, probable that some of the Churches arose, as it were, incidentally,

and that they sought no guidance from Jerusalem in selecting their elders or in arranging their mode of worship. To find in the letter Churches duly organised and pledged to render obedience to James and the Apostles, is to see a fiction of the imagination not sober fact.

CHAPTER VI.

JAMES AND THE CONGRESS AT JERUSALEM.

TWO or three years after the Epistle was written, there was held what is commonly known as the Council of Jerusalem. That conference or convention was perhaps the most critical event in the history of the primitive Church. The question then in debate affected the very existence of Christianity. Was Christianity distinct from Judaism, independent, unique? Or was it but an extension or development of Judaism? Must a man, in order to become a Christian, become a Jew? Must he fulfil the law of Moses in order to be saved; or, on the other hand, did his salvation depend on his obedience to the will of Jesus? These were the issues put before the Congress, and it is evident that they involved the question of the very nature of Christianity. The Congress decided that Christianity is distinct from Judaism, and that consequently circumcision, the essential rite of Judaism, was not required in the case of Gentile Christians.

The controversy as to the necessity of circumcision was due to the action of certain members of the Church of Jerusalem, who crept secretly into the

Church of Antioch, and there asserted that no uncircumcised Christian could be saved. Whether they had the audacity to claim the sanction of the Apostles for their tenet cannot be known, but doubtless they were not slow to affirm that the opinion they held was widely entertained in Jerusalem. The view these enunciated was at variance alike with the convictions and the practice of the Church at Antioch. Ever since its foundation, some time before A.D. 40, that Church had admitted Gentiles without imposing upon them either circumcision or, as it would appear, any Jewish observance whatever. The fellowship of Jew and Gentile in Christian worship was unrestricted. No trace exists that the Jewish section of the Church had the slightest scruple in associating on equal terms with the Gentile. The language of the Acts, of the Epistle to the Galatians, and of the Epistle of James, if its testimony may be taken into account, all suggest that the intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Antioch was unfettered by a single condition. This fact is of great significance, not only as an indication of the views of Barnabas and Paul and of the Church at Antioch, but also of the views of the Apostles. The Church at Antioch consisted almost from the first of Gentiles as well as of Jews. Doubtless the unknown missionaries by whom the Gospel was first preached in Antioch addressed themselves in the first instance to the Jews of the Synagogue there; but very speedily it would appear they turned to the

Gentiles as well, with the result that the Christian community of Antioch was from the beginning composed of Jews and Gentiles. How long it was until the Gentile element gained the ascendancy cannot be settled, but the Jewish members of the Church must always have been a considerable number. The rapid growth of the Church was largely due to the agency of Barnabas, who had been deputed by the Church of Jerusalem to visit the new community and to form his judgment on what he saw. He was speedily convinced that the inclusion of Gentiles within the Church was a work of God, and he threw himself with all the energy of his intellect and heart into the task of building up and consolidating the new Church. He had the discernment also to recognise that Antioch was a sphere in which the special endowments of Paul would find full scope. Accordingly he brought Paul from Tarsus, and they laboured side by side with remarkable success. At their instance or, at any rate, with their approval, no questions were raised as to the mutual relations of Gentiles and Jews. But this line of action must have been known and approved of by the Apostles. Barnabas was their delegate and representative, and would undoubtedly inform them concerning what was done. They must therefore have been aware that Jews and Gentiles sat side by side at the Lord's Supper. It is impossible to conceive them ignorant of this and similar facts, for the intercourse between Jerusalem and Antioch was

frequent, and the presence of Agabus and other prophets shows that the relations between the two Churches were close and friendly. If, then, the Apostles were aware of the practice of the Church of Antioch, they cannot but have approved of it. Had they esteemed it to be any infringement of Christian principle, they must at once have condemned it. It follows, then, that the Apostles cannot have regarded the observance of the Mosaic Law as a condition of salvation, nor even as a term of communion between Jews and Gentiles. Their convictions were doubtless those of the Church of Jerusalem too; but this does not preclude the view that some members of that church believed circumcision to be indispensable for salvation, and sought to enforce this tenet on the minds of their fellow-Christians. Whether those who entertained this opinion were members of the church from the first, or whether they had lately joined it, cannot be learned. They formed probably a small but active body, and the reports which reached them concerning the foundation of the new Gentile churches on the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas raised their fanaticism to a white heat. The sceptre would finally depart from Israel if its characteristic rite were to remain unperformed. Animated by the spirit of proselytism, and possibly too by hostility to the teaching of Paul and Barnabas, they betook themselves to Antioch, and there insisted with intense vehemence that no uncircumcised Gentile could be saved. The avowal of such a con-

viction engendered great excitement among the Christians at Antioch. The new tenet was disturbing alike to Gentile and Jewish Christians, serving to create a gulf between them, and to destroy the fellowship that had hitherto existed. However specious, it was plainly subversive of the cardinal truths of Christianity, as well as at variance with the providence of God, under the guidance of which Gentiles had been admitted unconditionally within the Church. The new doctrine was at once challenged by Paul and Barnabas, who doubtless showed its inconsistency with the essential nature of Christianity, the case of Cornelius, and the past history of the Church at Antioch. But arguments of this kind, however convincing, were ineffectual with the bigots of Jerusalem, who simply reiterated their assertion that circumcision was necessary to salvation. The slightest knowledge of human nature teaches that the effect produced on weak and narrow minds by such an asseveration must have been great. Not a few Gentile Christians may have asked themselves whether the new tenet was not true, and were doubtless filled with perplexity and pain. Under the circumstances it was decided, apparently with the concurrence of all parties, to bring the question before the Church at Jerusalem. Whether this suggestion came from Paul himself or not, he could not fail to recognise in it an indication of God's will. His own statement is that he went up to Jerusalem at this time because of a revelation made to him (Gal 2^a). This fact shows that

he did not go there reluctantly or under compulsion. With his usual sagacity he perceived that the subject in dispute affected the very essence of Christianity; that his future career depended on its settlement, and that it could be determined nowhere except in Jerusalem. Nor could he entertain any doubt as to the views of Peter and James at least on the matter. His intercourse with these leaders had convinced him that their conception of Christianity was fundamentally the same as his own. To him and to them alike faith in Christ was the sole requirement for admission into the Church, and it was impossible for him to believe that they would impose circumcision on the Gentiles as a condition of their being received. He went up to Jerusalem, not to discover the source from which the zealots for the Law drew their support, and just as little to argue his case before the Apostles as if they constituted the supreme court of the Church; but to determine an issue which he felt assured could be settled in one way only, and that the way already followed within the Church of Antioch. The statement of the Acts (15*), that the Church at Antioch deputed Paul and Barnabas along with some others to repair to Jerusalem and state the matter in dispute to the Church there, is quite consistent with the statement of Paul that he went up by revelation. From the narrative of Paul in Galatians and of Luke in Acts it is plain that a series of private conferences was held as well as one or two conventions of the

whole Church. To determine the number and order of these is not necessary here. But it is essential to learn what took place in the private interviews of Paul and Barnabas on the one hand with James, Peter and John on the other, and also what was the final decision of the Church itself.

Very notable is the language in which Paul refers to James. He is placed at least on a level with Peter and John. Like them he is a leader (Gal 2^o) and a pillar of the Church (Gal 2^o). His name is even mentioned before theirs. To infer from this circumstance that he occupied a higher position in the Church of Jerusalem than they did, would be hasty, for the enumeration of the names may be purely accidental. But that his name could be properly mentioned in such a position shows that his influence and power were at least equal to theirs. It is quite plain that in the judgment of Paul his authority was as great as that belonging to Peter or to John. Paul attached as much weight to the recognition of his teaching and apostleship by James as he did to its recognition by Peter and John. If, as is probable, the estimation in which James, Peter, and John were held was due to their personal ascendancy, it is plain that no common gifts had won for James a place in the affection and councils of the Church not inferior to those filled by the foremost and most beloved of the apostolic band.

But Paul is not only a witness to the high position of James, he also states that his views were identical

in principle with his own. He put before James, Peter, and John the gospel which he was in the habit of preaching among the Gentiles, with the result that they expressed their entire concurrence with him. They did not dissent in the least from the doctrines he taught or from the precepts he enjoined. They did not disapprove of his course in not imposing circumcision on others than Jews, for they recognised that the apostleship of the uncircumcision had as clearly been committed to him by God as the apostleship of the circumcision to themselves. No clearer or more explicit affirmation of the identity not merely of spirit but of doctrine and practice between these three Apostles and himself can be given than his assertion that no new instruction was given him, no additional requirement made of him by any of the Three (Gal 2¹²).

As it was apparent to James and to his colleagues that Paul had been especially chosen by God to be the Apostle of others than Jews, it was arranged between them that Paul and Barnabas should prosecute their mission among the non-Jewish peoples, while they themselves should continue as before to labour for the conversion of the Jews. They doubtless recognised that their function of proclaiming the gospel throughout the world could, for the time at least, be best discharged in this way. Paul and Barnabas were better qualified to evangelise the Gentiles: while they in their turn were better qualified to evangelise the Jews. By their joint

labours the duty of preaching the gospel to the world would be accomplished.

It would seem that no misconception as to the nature of this arrangement could arise. Yet upon few questions has there been greater diversity of opinion than respecting the significance of the phrases "the gospel of the circumcision" and the "gospel of the uncircumcision." It has been supposed that these expressions denote respectively two distinct gospels, one for the Jews and one for the Gentiles, the former gospel insisting on circumcision as obligatory on Jews, and the latter asserting that it was not binding on Gentiles. But this interpretation is surely unwarranted. Could the Apostles have agreed to preach the necessity of circumcision to the Jews? It is impossible that they could have done so in the sense that the fulfilment of this obligation was a condition of salvation. For such an opinion was as foreign to the convictions of James as of Paul himself. The only necessity which either James or Paul could allow was that of expediency. But is it conceivable that this expediency was elevated into a dogma or principle? Is it credible that Paul or even James would have thought it wise, in preaching the gospel to the Jews, to raise this question of circumcision; and could either of them have been a party to an agreement whereby that rite was spoken of as necessary even in the lower sense of expediency? Such an interpretation of the phrase the "gospel of the circumcision" is unnatural. The term simply denotes

the sphere in which the gospel was to be preached and not its substance. The gospel of the circumcision was the same as the gospel of the uncircumcision. There was no difference between them as regards their contents. The difference lay merely in the fields in which they were proclaimed.

But can the distinction in question be spoken of as one of sphere? Is not the principle underlying it religious rather than geographical? The mission of James, Peter, and John was to the Jews; that of Barnabas and Paul, to the Nations. Surely the contrast here is that of peoples rather than of localities. No doubt the language of the compact, literally understood, bears this sense. But it needs to be interpreted in the light of the minds of those who used it and of the practice which they followed. Even if we had possessed no information as to how Paul interpreted the agreement, it would probably have been rightly understood as referring to localities rather than to persons. But this construction is placed beyond the possibility of doubt by the action of Paul, and inferentially by the action of the Apostles so far as the period covered by the Book of Acts is concerned. There is no trace in that book of any endeavours of the Twelve to preach to the Jews among the Gentiles; while, on the other hand, Paul's invariable rule was to approach the Jews with the offer of the gospel in the first instance. It is plain, then, that the usual interpretation of the agreement as virtually geographical is correct.

The circumstance that Paul preached to the Jews as well as to the Gentiles shows the only possible sense of the expression "gospel of the circumcision." Paul preached the gospel of the circumcision as freely as the gospel of the uncircumcision. But it is impossible to believe that in preaching the gospel he recommended the practice of circumcision as necessary for the Jews under existing circumstances, though not as a term of salvation. A question of this kind lay beyond the horizon of his thoughts or purposes. Again, there is no evidence that he ever sought to dissuade a single Jew from following his hereditary customs, or that he ever spoke a single word against circumcision as an ordinance for Jews.

It was evident, however, to the Apostles that it was not enough for them to be united in their views as to the essence of Christianity, or as to the spheres of labour which they should separately occupy. The practical question of what was to be done in Churches composed partly of Jews and partly of Gentiles must be dealt with. Were the Jews to abandon their hereditary customs and to mix freely with the Gentiles? What was this but to ask them to renounce the Law? And yet how could there be a united Christian Church unless they did so? The question how to facilitate intercourse between the two branches of the Church in a community like Antioch was doubtless earnestly and repeatedly considered by James, Paul, and the rest in private; and the fruit of their deliberations was the proposal afterwards sub-

mitted by James to the public conference. For to suppose that they entered the conference ignorant of one another's minds or without a distinct understanding as to what was to be done is hardly permissible. They were far too wise to act in any such way. They must have felt that complete agreement on their part was necessary if they were to carry the Church along with them. It is therefore reasonable to hold that they arranged beforehand the order in which they should speak, and even possibly the particular points to which they should address themselves at the public convention. In this case the proposals made by James were not his own proposals merely, but proposals approved of by Paul and Barnabas as well. It is possible that they emanated from him in the first instance; but whether they did so or not they were in no sense his exclusively.

The Congress met, consisting of the entire Christian Church of Jerusalem, with which the final decision of the question undoubtedly rested. Very speedily differences of opinion showed themselves, and the discussion grew keen and protracted. The champions of circumcision, if comparatively few, were strenuous and vehement in asserting their principles. At length Peter rose (Ac 15⁷). He called attention mainly to two points. First of all, the question under discussion had in his view been already settled. The conversion of Cornelius, preceded as it was by an express revelation from God and sealed by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, proved incontestably that it was the will of God that Gentiles

should be received within the Church without being circumcised. But not only had the will of God been plainly announced in the case of Cornelius. Every Christian knew that salvation was dependent upon faith. Purity of heart was salvation, and this purification had been freely given by God to Cornelius and his friends. He had not required that the Gentiles should be circumcised. Hence it was not their duty to impose the yoke of the Law upon Gentile Christians. They themselves no longer sought salvation from the observance of the Law, but through the grace of God. How then could they dare to enforce it upon the Gentiles?

The speech of Peter was followed by speeches from Barnabas and Paul (Ac 15¹²). With great prudence they confined themselves to an account of their first missionary journey. They simply reported what Churches they had founded, and what converts they had made. They seem to have deliberately abstained from discussing the question before the Conference, doubtless recognising, on the one hand, that this was a question for the Conference rather than for them; and, on the other hand, that the strongest argument in favour of the view which they were known to hold was a simple description of the work they had been enabled to do.

After they had ceased, James stood up. It had doubtless been arranged that he should not speak till this stage. But no inference can be drawn from the time at which he spoke, or from the proposals he made, either as to his presidency of the Congress or as

to his official rank. Disputation as to whether Peter or he filled the chair, or as to whether Peter's or his voice was the more authoritative, is ridiculous, because utterly foreign to the occasion. It is true that Peter enunciated the truth which governed the decision of the Assembly, and that James proposed the actual terms of the resolution finally adopted; but these facts have no bearing on the question of their precedence or dignity. It has frequently been asserted that the tone of authority and finality with which James spoke proves that he occupied the chair. But the words 'I judge' are no more than a simple expression of opinion, and are certainly not the decision of a supreme ruler.

The brief abstract of the speech delivered by James (Ac 15¹³⁻²¹) is noteworthy for its strong Hebraic tone and also for its use of the LXX. The reference to Peter as Symeon, and the language in which the action of God is described, breathe a Hebraic spirit. But this was exactly what was to be expected at such a time and with such an audience. The speaker was a Jew; his hearers were chiefly Jews; he was speaking in Jerusalem; and the language he employed was almost certainly Aramaic. Only the more remarkable is the circumstance that he is made to quote a prophecy of Amos in the language of the LXX, and that in a form deviating widely from the original Hebrew.

The speech dwells on two topics. It proves first of all that the admission of the Gentiles to the Church is in accordance with the teaching of prophecy, and it

then lays down the terms or conditions on which the question before the Congress should be settled.

James began by expressing his hearty agreement with the speech of Peter. He took precisely the same view of the incident of Cornelius which Peter had done. The admission of Cornelius within the Church was an act of God and in strictest harmony with the views of the prophets, who had foretold the inclusion of the Gentiles within the Church. An instance of such a prophecy James found in the language of Amos 9¹¹ (Ac 15¹⁶⁻¹⁸):

"After these things I will return,
And I will build again the tabernacle of David, which has fallen ;
And I will build again the ruins thereof,
And I will set it up :
That the residue of men may seek after the Lord,
And all the Gentiles, upon whom My name is called, saith the
Lord who maketh these things known from the beginning of the
world."

The original import of the prophecy is clear. The dynasty of David is to be restored to its former splendour, and the nations which had revolted brought again under its authority, because through their conquest by David they had passed into the ownership of Jehovah. In the prophecy, as quoted by James, the words, "That the residue of men may seek after the Lord," are substituted for the phrase in the Hebrew, "That they may inherit the remnant of Edom." It scarcely admits of doubt that the original text is represented by the existing Hebrew text, and the difference between the Hebrew and the LXX may not

have been unmarked by James. He probably preferred the latter version as illustrating and confirming the truth on which he is dwelling. He may even have translated from the LXX into the vernacular rather than from the Hebrew, for this is the simplest and most adequate explanation of the presence of the citation in its existing form. The application of the prophecy thus quoted is obvious. The re-establishment of the kingdom and dynasty of David takes place in the person of his descendant Jesus the Messiah. And the subjugation of the nations which had thrown off the yoke of Israel is fulfilled by the admission of the Gentiles within the Christian pale. The last words of the quotation are not found in the present text of Amos, and may represent either a different text or an addition made by James himself. The point of the reference is either to the foreknowledge and foreordination by God of the conversion of the Gentiles, or to the announcement of that conversion made by prophecy from the most ancient times.

It has been said that this appeal of James to prophecy proves that the oracles of the prophets had more weight with him than the principles of the gospel. But this conclusion is unwarranted. Peter had already expounded the question of principle. Was it necessary for James to deal with it also? Besides, does the mere reference to the fulfilment of prophecy imply that the voice of prophecy is necessarily more authoritative than the principles of the gospel? This does not follow. Moreover, the

argument of James was most appropriate and convincing. No consideration was fitted to tell more powerfully upon his audience than the argument from prophecy. If it could be shown from prophecy that the Gentiles as Gentiles were to be admitted to fellowship with the Jews, the question in debate was already determined. (Lechler, *Ap. Times*, ii. 226, thinks that he can discern in James' speech the silent hope that the Gentiles may avail themselves of the opportunity presented to them to become acquainted with the Law of Moses, and may in due time submit themselves to it freely. So, too, Rothe, *Anf. d. ch. Kirche*, 314.)

The second part of the speech lays down the conditions which Gentiles should be asked to observe. These conditions are, if possible, more remarkable for what they are not than for what they are. They are utterly inconsistent with the common opinion that James was a zealot for the Jewish Law, and prove him to have been a man of a large mind and heart, substantially at one with Peter and even with Paul and Barnabas. It is noteworthy that he does not even allude to the suggestion that circumcision should be imposed upon the Gentiles. This, the supreme question before the assembly, he passes by as virtually settled by the speech of Peter, to the terms of which he adhered. Nor does he propose that a single distinctively Jewish ordinance should be observed by the Gentiles. The whole Law, including the Sabbath and the prescriptions as to foods, is given up. No fact illustrates so signally the liberality of sentiment

which he entertained, and which has been too little and too seldom recognised. James was, in truth, a little disposed to 'trouble' the Gentiles as Peter himself. He simply suggests that the Gentiles should be directed to abstain from the pollutions of idols from fornication, from things strangled, and from blood. He assigns as a reason for these prohibitions the fact that Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the Synagogue every Sabbath (Ac 15²¹). The force of these words has been keenly debated; nor has agreement as to their import yet been reached. Two interpretations claim consideration as at once probable in themselves and as commanding wide support. According to the former of these, the meaning is that it is superfluous to address such injunctions to the Jews because they are already familiar with them from the Law. An obvious and perhaps conclusive objection to this interpretation is that James is referring throughout to Gentile and not to Jewish Christians. Nothing is said as to any directions required by the latter. Hence the words must imply that the restrictions spoken of were necessary if there was to be a union of Jews and Gentiles within the Church. The Mosaic Law was preached in every city in which Jews were found, and the Jewish Christians who worshipped in the Synagogue could not, in view of the prescriptions of the Law, hold social intercourse with Gentile Christians who might follow practices shocking to their moral sense and repugnant to their

most hallowed usages. The injunctions raised no question of principle, but merely specified the conditions which would render fellowship between Jews and Gentiles within the same Church possible. If the Gentiles consented to observe these prescriptions, it would be possible for Christian Jews, the Law notwithstanding, to enter into religious fellowship with Gentile Christians.

What precisely is the meaning of the four abstinences here named? The phrase 'pollutions of idols' refers to participation in idol worship generally, and more particularly, as is suggested by verse 29, participation in sacrifices made to idols. Such sacrifices were an ordinary feature of life throughout the Empire, there being few occasions of any importance on which they were not offered. A portion only of the sacrifices was burnt upon the altar; what remained was set forth as a feast at home or exposed for sale in the market.

The second proposal of James deals with fornication. This term must be taken literally, for how otherwise could it be understood by those to whom it was addressed? The word is plain and unambiguous in meaning, and never bears any other sense except when qualified by the context. Accordingly the many ingenious explanations of its force in the present connection may be dismissed. This is the case even with what is possibly the most widely accepted meaning, according to which the phrase denotes incest or marriage within the prohibited degrees. There is no evidence that the word is ever

used in this special sense except when the meaning is made plain by the context. And the argument in its favour relied upon as decisive depends on a view of the character of the four precepts under discussion which is, to say the least, doubtful, and which certainly cannot furnish a rule by which to explain the term here employed. The expression then refers to sexual immorality in general, and not to any special form of it.

The third requirement forbids the use of things strangled. No historical proof of the existence of such a custom in Gentile or Jewish circles prior to the Congress has been adduced. There is no evidence to show that the Jews regarded the flesh of strangled animals as unlawful. Such proof is certainly not found in the passage commonly cited in this connection, Lv 17¹³: "And whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, which taketh in hunting any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust." The Jews may have refused to partake of the flesh of strangled animals because the blood was not poured out. But if such food was disallowed on this ground, the third requirement can scarcely be distinguished from the fourth, for the presence of blood in strangled animals must have been a reason for its being pronounced unlawful food. It is, however, possible that the method of death by strangulation was peculiarly distasteful to the Jews, because the blood, which to them

was the life, was left in the body, and that this requirement indicates the one method of putting an animal to death which no conscientious Jew could tolerate, while the fourth relates not to the method of killing, but to the actual partaking of blood as food.

The fourth prescription is easily understood. From the most ancient times not a few peoples have regarded blood with extraordinary reverence, as the symbol of the mystery of life. To these peoples the Jews belonged, and from their earliest history they were taught to consider the blood as the seat of life (Gn 9⁶, Lv 17¹¹, Dt 12²³). The command not to use blood as food, or flesh not free from blood, was a fundamental precept of the Mosaic legislation, and was indeed supremely important, because the blood according to that legislation was the means of atonement. But even in the Pentateuch the precept to abstain from blood is represented as a primitive ordinance. (Dillmann on Gn 9⁶; Kalisch, *Leviticus*, 'Essay on the Prohibition of Blood.')

Such, then, were the prescriptions which James proposed should be laid on the Gentiles. What explanation is to be given of their selection? Whence were they derived? The answer most commonly given is that these precepts correspond to the legislation contained in Lv 17, 18, which was imposed equally upon strangers and native Jews. The requirements as to things sacrificed to idols are found in Lv 17⁷, as to blood in 17¹⁰, as to things strangled in 17¹³, and as to fornication in

18⁶⁻²⁶. But this view, however popular, has little support. The resemblance between the four specific precepts of James and the many precepts of Leviticus touching strangers is very slight. The contents of the two chapters specified differ widely from the four requirements of James. Only by the most arbitrary processes can a close correspondence be established between them. It is indeed impossible to read the two chapters referred to, as well as the whole legislation affecting strangers, without perceiving how dissimilar are the restrictions suggested by James from the legislation of Leviticus. To deny that any connection exists between the ordinances in Leviticus as to strangers and the provisions laid down by James would be unreasonable, but no direct relation between them can be made out.

Another common explanation identifies the requirements with what are known as the seven precepts of Noah. These were (Schürer, *Jewish People*, II. ii. 318): to obey those in authority; to sanctify the name of God; to abstain from idolatry; to commit no fornication; to do no murder; not to steal; not to eat living flesh, namely, flesh with the blood in it. But the four prescriptions of James are quite different from these seven precepts, and no explanation can be given why the entire seven and not four of them only should have been chosen. Moreover, it is, to say the least, very doubtful whether these seven precepts existed in the time of James. It is more probable that the four requirements of James preceded than that they

succeeded the seven precepts ascribed to Noah. Further, even if these latter precepts were current, there is no evidence that they ever embodied more than a mere speculation. They were intended to apply to all who lived permanently in the Holy Land, and nothing is more certain than that they were not observed by the Roman and Greek inhabitants of that land in our Lord's time. Once more, it is contended that the strangers sojourning in the land of Israel on whom these seven precepts were binding are the same as 'the fearers of God,' the Gentiles who attached themselves more or less closely to Judaism but who remained uncircumcised. The identification, however, of 'the sojourner' with 'the fearer of God' is quite arbitrary, and there is no proof that the class who frequented the synagogue without being circumcised accepted the seven commandments of Noah.

But against both these views there is the insuperable argument that neither of them, strictly interpreted, is consistent with the principle that the Gentiles were to be exempt from the Jewish law. For obviously they proceed on the assumption that certain Jewish regulations are to be imposed on the Gentiles. It may, indeed, be urged that the four abstinences, though derived from existing Jewish requirements, were not meant to be treated as such, but simply as affording a basis for common religious worship and fellowship between Jews and Gentiles in mixed churches. But is this view in harmony with their alleged origin?

Again, it has been suggested that the precepts were intended as indications of true religion and not of Judaism in the exclusive sense (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 71). It was of the utmost consequence that the Gentile converts should not be tempted to misconceive the nature of Christian liberty. Hence the propriety of laying upon them the four restraints spoken of. But can this view be maintained in the face of the contents of the precepts and of their history in the Church? How can the presence of the precept relating to things strangled be thus explained? Had the command as to blood stood alone, it might have been argued with much plausibility that the conditions were wholly moral; but it is hardly possible to maintain this opinion, seeing that things strangled as well as blood are mentioned. While it is true that abstinence from things strangled is possibly only a special instance of the abstinence from blood, yet the insertion of this case as independent and special renders the moral explanation of the four precepts very questionable. Its presence can be satisfactorily explained only by circumstances peculiar to the time; by the dislike and disgust felt for the practice by the Jews. The fact, too, that the prohibitions relating to blood and things strangled soon ceased to be observed within the Church, tends to show that they were hardly considered as signs or embodiments of true religion.

The explanation of the choice of the four precepts must accordingly be sought elsewhere. The most

obvious quarter in which to seek it is in the sentiments and feelings of the two sections of the Christian Church. The practices referred to may have been condemned in the course of the dispute by those who insisted that the Gentiles should be circumcised, and it is possible that James proposed to satisfy them by prohibiting these practices (Lightfoot, *Gal.* 295). But would these four offences alone have been specified by the opponents of circumcision, and would James have taken it on himself to embody them in the decision of the Council without consulting his fellow-Apostles? Is it not simpler and more natural to hold that these four prohibitions were the fruit of mature discussion between Peter, James, and John on the one hand, and Paul and Barnabas on the other? When they were conferring together, the first subject that would rise after the question of principle had been settled was, what was to be done in the case of the Church of Antioch? The Gentiles were to be pronounced free from the Jewish Law. But were no restraints of any kind to be placed on them? Could the Jews be expected to mix freely with them if they systematically violated their most hallowed usages? Was it certain that even the moral conduct of the Gentiles would be such as became Christians? Would every Gentile acknowledge that fornication was a grave sin; that participation in a sacrifice offered to idols was virtually idolatry? Was it not desirable that they should be told in plain words to abstain from these transgressions; and would it not be well

also, in the interests of unity and concord, that they should also be asked to avoid the use of things strangled and of blood? Such self-restraint on their part would be no infringement of principle, and would tend to produce friendly relations between their Jewish brethren and themselves.

It is almost certain, then, that the origin of the restrictions is to be found in their aim. And there can be little doubt that what James proposed to accomplish by means of them was the fusion of the two branches of the Christian Church. It is quite evident that he had no intention to impose the Jewish Law upon the Gentiles, for he expressly repudiates such a purpose. He does not ask them to be circumcised, to observe the Sabbath, to conform to the law of meats and drinks, or to practise ceremonial ablutions. After declaring that they should not be subjected to the Jewish Law, it would have been absurd for him to propose that they should keep a mere fragment of that Law. To have made any portion of it binding upon them would have been to violate the principle he himself acknowledged, namely, that the Gentiles were free from all Jewish obligations, and would have been inconsistent with the truth that salvation is of faith. To have enjoined the four precepts as Jewish requirements, or as indispensable to salvation, would, in fact, have been to decide in favour of the false brethren and not in favour of the Church at Antioch.

Nor could the purpose of James have been to place

the Gentiles in a position of inferiority to the Jews within the Church, to assign to them a lower rank like that given to 'the fearers of God' within the Synagogue. This is inconsistent with his statement that the Gentiles as such were to be received into the Church. If this were the will of God, it implied that they were to occupy the same position as Jews. Besides, to put them on a lower grade was virtually to deny them full citizenship within the kingdom, and to affirm that to the Jews alone belonged its highest privileges. But such a relation of the Gentiles to the Jews is plainly inconsistent with salvation by faith.

The restrictive clauses suggested by James had no relation, then, to the question of the salvation of the Gentiles, or of the respective places of Jews and Gentiles within the kingdom of God. His object was to secure the union in social fellowship of the two branches of the Church in mixed communities. In the interests of Christianity it was indispensable that there should be no schism within the Church. Jews and Gentiles must mix freely together, and must take their places at the table of the Lord. The proposals of James were framed with this end in view. He saw at once how necessary and how difficult it was to persuade his Jewish fellow-believers to join in common worship with their Gentile fellow-Christians, and more especially so long as these continued to adhere to habits of life and usages peculiarly abhorrent to the Jews. To prevent so

disastrous a result as discord and disunion it was meet that the Gentile Christians should submit to certain restrictions that might form a basis for common worship and intercourse. The concessions he suggested were such as would satisfy the Jew and could without difficulty or sacrifice of principle be observed by the Gentile. It is possible that he and his fellow-Apostles were aware that some Gentile Christians at Antioch, influenced by the atmosphere in which they had been brought up, were indisposed to regard the eating of flesh offered to idols and fornication as moral offences. The sins of idolatry and impurity were peculiarly hateful to the Jews, not only because of their divergence from the Law of Moses but also because of their incompatibility with true religion; yet they were hardly ranked as sins by the Gentiles, and it was therefore well that Gentile Christians should have abstinence from them imposed by a special rule. The very existence of such a rule would make it much easier for a Jew to join them in worship. Still easier would worship be for him, if he was aware that his Gentile fellow-Christian had undertaken to abstain from things strangled and from blood. The profound moral horror with which the Jews regarded the eating of blood can hardly be understood by us, but it doubtless lay at the root of the suggestion made by James.

This view of the purpose of James seems almost self-evident, and to be demanded by the circumstances of the case. How, it may be asked, could the Con-

ference neglect the settlement of so urgent and practical a question as that of the relations between the Gentile and Jewish sections of the Church? Could such men as the Apostles have failed to provide for an emergency that had actually arisen? Why should James have mentioned these precepts at all had this not been his purpose? Was it possible that he could have contemplated the permanent division of the Church at Antioch into two groups? Was this really his policy? Or, on the other hand, did he not foresee the effect of the enactment he suggested? Surely it is to do James and the other Apostles the utmost injustice to hold that they did not deal with a question inseparably connected with the question of principle which they had just settled. They proposed to decide that no Gentile should be circumcised in order to become a Christian. They probably also took for granted that the Jews would adhere to the Law. Now a strict observance of the Law meant for the Jew the avoidance of social intercourse, and especially of fellowship at meals, with the Gentiles. But this avoidance amounted to a virtual denial that his Gentile fellow-believers were fellow-Christians. How then were the two sections of the Church to unite for service and worship? The obvious path was that suggested by James, that of requiring reasonable concessions from the Gentiles. The Congress, in fact, would have stultified itself had it neglected to determine the relations between Jews and Gentiles in such a community as Antioch.

It has, however, been urged that the decision of the Conference does not even look at the case of intercourse in mixed Churches (Weiss, *Biblical Theol.* i. 202); for, according to Ac 15²¹, the concessions of the Gentile Christians were made not on account of the Jewish Christians, but because of the synagogue.

This interpretation, however, is altogether unsatisfactory. Who can believe that certain obligations were imposed on the Gentiles with a view to the conversion of Jews, and that one of the principal resolutions of the Congress bore not on the relation of Jewish and Gentile converts which called loudly and instantly for settlement, but on the vague and remote question of the possible conversion of the Jews to Christianity?

Again, it has been contended (Zahn, *Eint.* ii. 431) that the four precepts are not concerned with the relations between Jewish and Gentile Christians, for the narrative in Acts does not contain a syllable on this topic. A Jewish Christian would have contracted Levitical defilement by holding social and religious fellowship even with a Gentile obeying the four commands. This last assertion is true, but its application is much wider than is often perceived. Had the Law been acted on by the Jewish Christians, there could have been no religious intercourse of any kind between them and the Gentiles. Is it possible to hold that so obvious a fact escaped the notice of James, or Peter, or Paul? The speeches of Peter and James presuppose fellowship between the two sections

of the Church, and the aim of James was to lay down conditions which would render that fellowship practicable. The main, if not the sole purpose of the four conditions, was the maintenance and promotion of Christian union in mixed Churches. Of what value or significance would have been these restrictions in purely Gentile Churches? Their one sphere was that of communities consisting of Jews and Gentiles. Further, it is asserted (McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, 215) that the resolution of the Council betrays no apprehension of the difficulties existing in Antioch. But the situation is exactly that contemplated by the resolution. It was meant that the Jewish Christians should continue to worship side by side with their Gentile fellow-Christians as before. The Jew was to treat the Gentile as an equal and a brother. James undoubtedly intended that the provisions he suggested should govern the relations between Jews and Gentiles, and that by means of them they should meet on common ground.

It is virtually implied in the conclusion now reached as to the nature of the four precepts, that they were novel, and that they had not been already acted on in any Christian communities. Had they been, as many writers believe, simply the rules regulating the admission of Gentile hearers to the Synagogue, it would be highly probable that they were already in force within Christian circles. For Christian Jews in mixed communities might well expect from their Gentile fellow-Christians compliance

with such observances as the Jews required from Gentile worshippers in the synagogue. Compliance would be the easier, because most of the Gentile Christians belonged in the first instance to this class. But, as we have seen, the precepts were not the obligations imposed upon 'the fearers of God' in the synagogue. Is it likely, then, that they were in existence anywhere before the Assembly met? Had the Jews and Gentiles in any mixed community come to such an arrangement as that indicated in the decision, and was it the knowledge that such mutual concession had already wrought well which induced James to submit his proposal to the Congress? This opinion is captivating, and would, if true, throw fresh light on the decision; but it is open to weighty objections. If a compromise existed anywhere, it would have been in Antioch; yet no such rules appear to have existed there. (Zahn, *Einl.* ii. 432, believes that the rules were acted on in Antioch.) The evidence points to the absolute freedom of the Church in Antioch from all Jewish restrictions. Such absence accounts most readily for the demand made by the Judaisers who visited Antioch and for the controversy which they raised. Had they found the community there abstaining from blood and from things strangled, their demand, if made at all, would probably have taken a different shape. Further, the narrative in Acts suggests that the precepts mentioned by James were new. He does not refer to them as already in force anywhere, but adduces them as

contributing to the settlement of the question in debate. The question was now raised for the first time, and the rules suggested by James must therefore have been novel.

Did James intend that the restrictions of which he spoke should be binding permanently on all Gentile Christians? Or was the decision meant to be local and temporary? Perhaps the contrast suggested by these questions lay beyond the horizon of James and his fellow-Apostles. The resolution of the Assembly was meant to endure as long as the circumstances which called it forth lasted. There is nothing in the speech of James, when submitting his proposals, which suggests that he thought of the decision as merely local and temporary; and the language which he employed on Paul's last visit to Jerusalem (Ac 21) shows that he regarded this decision of the Council as governing the relations between the Jewish and Gentile branches of the Church. But this circumstance does not prove that he conceived the restrictions to be of universal and lasting obligation. Such an opinion is at variance with the principles common to Paul, Peter, and himself, and with the purpose contemplated by the prohibitions. It can hardly be doubted that the rules laid down by the Convention were intended for all Churches in which the question of the relations between Jews and Gentiles should arise. Such Churches were pre-eminently those of Syria and Cilicia, to which the letter embodying the decision

of the Congress was addressed. To infer, however, from the limitation of the address that no other Churches were contemplated would be rash, for it is stated (Ac 16⁴) that Paul and Barnabas on their second missionary journey made known the restrictions to the Churches which they had founded on their former visit. On the other hand, the absence from the decision of the Congress of any reference to these Churches makes it plain that the Synod did not regard itself as legislating for the entire Church. Again, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, two at least of the prohibitions, those relating to fornication and to flesh offered in sacrifice, are fully dealt with by Paul (1 Co 5¹⁻¹³ 6¹⁸⁻²⁰ 8¹⁻³ 10¹⁴⁻²²) without any reference whatever to the decision of the Congress. He could not have proceeded in this way had he regarded the question of these observances as finally settled by the judgment of the Convention. He cannot, therefore, have taught in Corinth the obligation of the four precepts: otherwise it would have been impossible for the Corinthians to raise the questions concerned, or for him to discuss them as he does.

It is unnecessary to labour the argument against the unconditional character of these observances drawn from their nature and from their history in the Church, for it is impossible to deny that the character and history of the precepts alike forbid the view that they were intended to bind the consciences of all Christians. Further, this opinion, as

has been shown, is at variance with a just notion of the aim of the requirements. Intended simply to facilitate intercourse between the Jewish and Gentile sections of the Church, they ceased to be necessary when that end was gained, and were superfluous where its attainment was not required, as in the case of purely Jewish and of purely Gentile Churches. It may then be concluded that James, in making his suggestions, intended them to apply as long as the situation with which they dealt existed. Whether he believed that that situation would endure indefinitely cannot be ascertained. It is possible that he believed it would last to the Second Advent, but on this point it is impossible to speak. What must, however, be emphasised is the special purpose of the provisions; for this purpose involves their limited and transitory character.

The proposals made by James were accepted by the whole Assembly. They were welcomed as the best possible solution of the dispute that had arisen. If the view already expressed that Paul and Barnabas had had frequent interviews with Peter, James, and John, and that at these all the questions under discussion were fully examined and common action agreed on, the significance of the decision is plain. The Congress determined that the Gentiles were wholly free from any obligation to observe the Mosaic Law.

If, then, the final deliverance of the Congress was prepared beforehand by Paul and Barnabas along

with James, Peter, and John, it follows that the inference commonly drawn from the fact that James proposed the restrictive clauses of the decree becomes exceedingly precarious. It has often been contended that the logical result of the speech of Peter would have been the complete emancipation of the Gentiles from the Law, and that this would have become the decision of the Congress had it not been for the attitude of James. James had not yet reached the same convictions as Paul and Peter, and consequently could not have acquiesced in the exemption that either of them might have proposed. It must be allowed as possible that James in the private conferences may have been the first to suggest the necessity of certain restrictions, and may even have indicated what these should be. In his position as the local representative of the Church of Jerusalem such a proposal was natural. It came with propriety from the man who understood perhaps better than most the temper of the Jewish Christians. But there is no reason for thinking that Peter and Paul did not freely concur in the view taken by James as to the necessity of certain abstinences being enforced on the Gentiles in mixed Churches. Both of them were too sagacious not to perceive that the precepts suggested were required by the existing circumstances of the Church. Nor could either of them hesitate for a moment in cordially adopting them, as their selection raised no question of Christian principle. The responsibility, then, for the restrictive clauses of

the decision must rest not with James exclusively, but with Paul and Barnabas, Peter and John as well. And consequently the fact that it fell to James at the Congress to propose these clauses does not warrant the conclusion that he was more strongly attached to the Mosaic ordinances than Peter or John.

The credibility of Luke's report of the Convention has been repeatedly assailed alike in whole and in parts. It is unnecessary to discuss here the trustworthiness of his narrative in general. But the arguments advanced against the genuineness of the speech attributed to James deserve and reward consideration. It has been contended that the speech is unhistorical, the author of the Acts merely putting sentiments into his mouth, sentiments, too, quite at variance with those he actually entertained. What now are the reasons brought forward to support this view? It is alleged that if James made the quotation from Amos ascribed to him, he must have spoken in Greek, and that a speech in Greek delivered at a Congress in Jerusalem is out of the question. But both these assertions are precipitate. It is most probable that the proceedings of the Congress were carried on in Aramaic; but they might have been carried on in Greek,¹ as is shown by the fact that the crowd in Jerusalem which Paul addressed from the stairs evidently expected him to speak in Greek, not in Aramaic (Ac 22). It is possible, too, that some who went up from Antioch,

¹ Plumptre on Ac 15 holds that the discussion was carried on in Greek.

Titus, for example, were ignorant of Aramaic, and that for their sakes the discussion, if conducted in Aramaic, was also translated into Greek. But it by no means follows from the quotation made by James that he spoke in Greek and not in Aramaic. It is quite true that the language of the LXX in the passage in question diverges widely from that of the Hebrew text, and that James undoubtedly followed the version of the LXX. But why may he not have translated from the LXX into Aramaic? He was probably better acquainted with the LXX than with the Hebrew original. Why should he not then have made use of it? Under any circumstance, James was under the necessity of translating. Why should he not have translated from the Greek as readily as from the Hebrew, especially if the language of the Greek version were the more applicable to his purpose?

Again, it is alleged that the sentiment which regards the imposition of the Law on the Gentiles as a burden is derived from Paul. But this assertion is unwarranted. The view in question is Christian not Pauline. It is in no sense peculiar to Paul. It was the common opinion of the Christian Church, held as much, according to Paul's own testimony, by James, Peter, and John as by himself. It is the only view of the Law compatible with a correct interpretation of our Lord's teaching regarding the conditions of entrance into His kingdom, and even regarding the Law itself; and this teaching was confirmed by his attitude towards the Pharisees, who were the cham-

pions of the Law, and towards the usages which they regarded as binding.

It is further contended that James could not have submitted the proposals which are associated with his name, because Paul virtually asserts that none were made, and also because the dispute at Antioch would have been impossible had the Convention ratified the suggestions made by James. The first of these arguments rests on an erroneous interpretation of Paul's words (Gal 2⁶).¹ What Paul asserts is simply that James, Peter, and John accepted his teaching, and found nothing in it to amend. That the four prohibitions mentioned by James were adopted by the Council is not in the least degree at variance with Paul's statement; for these restrictions do not bear upon doctrine, but upon practice. The controversy at Antioch must be considered immediately. It is enough to say that the argument put forward in connection with it is wholly unconvincing.

Lastly, it has been urged that it is impossible that the James of the Acts could ever have been the leader of the party who opposed Paul throughout his whole life, and who continued to malign him long after his death. A James who believed that the Mosaic Law was not binding on the Gentiles, and who accepted the principle that Jews and Gentiles alike were saved by the grace of God (Ac 15¹¹), could never have become the leader of those Christians who were fanatically zealous for the Law, and who refused to

¹ Cf. p. 176.

acknowledge that any uncircumcised person was a Christian. This argument is conclusive, but destroys the position which it is meant to defend. James was never the leader of the party referred to. If its adherents used his name, they did so without his authority. Whether they acted thus while he was alive is uncertain, for the expression in Gal 2¹² does not imply that the persons spoken of formed a party called by his name. But, even though his name had been used by a section of the Church during his lifetime, it would not follow that these were his personal adherents and disciples. Why should the name of James not have been abused, as, for instance, the name of Peter at Corinth? No force can be attached to the position assigned to James in the Clementine literature, for that literature is fiction, not fact. The declaration of Paul is final and authoritative regarding the convictions of James. The only reasonable interpretation of that declaration is that they were both of the same mind on all the fundamental questions of Christianity, and especially on the question as to the obligation of the Law on the Gentiles.

The speech, then, of James is genuine, and as such ought to be carefully studied in connection with the letter which bears his name. The harmony between the two is remarkable. The attitude of James towards the Law in his Epistle prepares us for his attitude towards the question of circumcision at the Congress. The author of the Epistle could not have held that circumcision was required for salvation, and hence,

when the question came up at the Congress, James gave his voice against such an opinion. To the author of the letter the source of salvation was the grace of God, and faith the fundamental Christian virtue. The same truths are implied in the speech made by James at the Congress. But what is the significance of the agreement in spirit and in teaching between the James of the Epistle and the James of the Acts? How does it come to pass that the James of the Epistle and the James of the Acts are one and the same person? According to the view defended by several writers of eminence, the Epistle and the Acts are alike spurious. The Epistle was not written by James, the speech in Acts was not made by him. How then is the likeness between them to be explained? Had the author of Acts read the Epistle, or the author of the Epistle read the Acts? What a genius the writer must have been who was able from one forged work to forge another widely different in character, the points of resemblance between which do not strike the ordinary eye and are evidently incidental and undesigned! Further, the supposed authors of the Epistle and of the Acts delineated a James who, according to the view under discussion, is not the James of Christian history. What possible motives could induce them to depart from the tradition they received? These considerations vindicate afresh the genuineness alike of the Epistle and of the Acts. An impartial judge will not refuse to acknowledge that the James of the Epistle is the James of the Congress. He would also

add without hesitation that the James of the Epistle and of the Congress is also the James of the Epistle to the Galatians, and his final verdict would be that the James of several modern historians is not the James of history.

The decision of the Assembly was unanimous. Apostles, elders, and members alike approved of the views expressed by James, and their decision took the form which he suggested. It would, however, argue ignorance of human nature to conclude that this unanimity was in every case sincere and thorough. But certainly no voice was raised against the adoption of the course proposed. And, possibly for the time, a real unity of sentiment was generated by the testimony of Barnabas and Paul, and by the speeches of Peter and James. It was felt that the answer of the Congress must correspond to the gravity of the occasion. Accordingly, it was decided that the delegates from Antioch should be accompanied on their return thither by Judas Barsabbas and Silas, two men of eminent position and authority in the Church of Jerusalem, who should carry a letter embodying the views of the Synod, and should at the same time convey verbally to the Church at Antioch the sentiments of the Church in Jerusalem. The letter was written in the name of the whole Church, and was addressed to the Gentile Christians in Syria and Cilicia. It opened with an express disavowal and condemnation of those who had gone from Jerusalem to Antioch and taught the necessity of circumcision.

It declared that they had done so of their own accord, and that their teaching subverted the soul. The letter further stated that Judas Barsabbas and Silas had been selected to be its bearers, and to confirm its contents to the Church at Antioch by word of mouth. There was further contained in it an assertion of the love cherished in Jerusalem for Barnabas and Paul, and a just tribute to the Christian heroism which they had shown in their missionary labours. The letter closed with an enumeration of the four abstinences which were to be observed by them and which were described as necessary. Attention to these would bring peace and harmony to the community.

The sense in which the term 'necessary' is employed in this letter admits of no doubt. The necessity spoken of is not that of morals but of expediency. It relates to the circumstances of the Church and not to any conduct enjoined by the law of God.

The letter was possibly written by James. There is no argument against this view, for a document of this kind would hardly have been put into its present shape by Luke, and the resemblance between the form of the letter and of the opening verses of the Gospel of Luke is not such as to render it in the least degree likely that Luke impressed his characteristic style upon it. (So Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*.) The diction of the letter is strikingly akin to that of the Epistle of James, and hence the suggestion that it was composed by James himself acquires much probability.

There was a time when the genuineness of the

resolution of the Conference was more questioned than it is to-day. The spirit of historical criticism still runs riot at times, but no scholar with any reputation for insight will pronounce the so-called decree a mere fabrication. It bears on its face the plainest evidence of originality. It is a document which would have had no significance after the destruction of Jerusalem, and must indeed belong to the earliest years of the Church, for it deals with the question of the relations between Gentiles and Jews, a question which must have been stirred as soon as the conversion of Gentiles on any scale took place. Its contents are equally favourable to its historical character. The reference to the Holy Spirit and to the unity of sentiment of the Congress, the order of the names Paul and Barnabas, the Churches addressed, the repudiation of the bigots who stole into the church at Antioch, are conclusive proof of its authenticity.

It is argued, however, that it cannot have been passed at the time and in the manner specified, because it could not possibly be accepted by Paul.

The express testimony of Paul is alleged against its genuineness. Paul asserts that the leading Apostles imparted nothing to him (Gal 2^o). This assertion is held to exclude the four precepts of the decree. Had such enactments been made, it would have been impossible for Paul to say that James, Peter, and John had imparted nothing to him. But is this really the case? What is the true force of Paul's assertion? Is it not simply that the Apostles

were fully satisfied with his teaching, and that they found nothing in it to which they sought to add or from which they wished to take? His gospel required neither to be enlarged nor diminished. On all that constituted the central truths of Christianity they and he were one. This is plainly what he affirms. Will it be said that the four prohibitions, as viewed by Paul, form part of the essence of Christianity? Did their observance raise any question of principle? Was not that question determined when it was decided that circumcision should not be imposed on the Gentiles? It is certain that the four abstinences as interpreted by Paul bore no religious character. They were simply conditions of Christian fellowship to which no objection could be taken, but stood in no connection with the way in which salvation was to be had. A man's salvation was independent of them. It is to misconceive the teaching of Paul as well as to distort his language here, when the inference is drawn that the terms of the resolution of the Congress are inconsistent with Paul's declaration, that the Apostles, when conferring with him regarding his teaching, imparted nothing to him. Further, it must not be forgotten that the assertion by Paul refers to his private conference with the Apostles and not to the public Convention. Should a statement regarding one event be held to exclude a statement applicable to another?

But why, it is asked, if the decree was passed, is it not mentioned by Paul? Why is no trace of it to be

found in his Epistles? Why is it not mentioned, above all, in the Epistle to the Galatians? Would not the quotation of its terms have been the most decisive answer to the charges of his assailants? And why, too, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (8¹⁰) does Paul write as if the decree had no existence? It must be granted that the resolution is not mentioned or even implied in any of Paul's Epistles, and that the language of First Corinthians proves that its provisions were not in force in that Church. But there is no reason, as we have seen, for holding that the enactments were intended to be universal. Paul doubtless did not believe that they were required in the Church at Corinth, and they may never have been introduced into Europe. His silence respecting them, however, is no evidence that they were not passed. But why does he not refer to them in the Epistle to the Galatians? Why did he not shut the mouths of his enemies by quoting the determination of the Congress? Is it then so certain that the mention of the decree would have answered his purpose and effectually refuted the accusations of his traducers? To cite the decree would not have established any the more fully the unanimity of opinion between him and the leading Apostles, for that unanimity was far more strongly illustrated by the results of the private interview than by those of the Congress.

Again, as we have seen, the terms of the resolution had no religious significance in the eyes of Paul. What purpose then would have been served by a

reference to the decision? Would the Judaistic tendencies in the Church of Galatia have been lessened thereby? Is it not clear that the situation of the Galatian Churches was wholly different from the situation of the Church at Antioch? The Jewish Law was being forced on the Church at Antioch, the Churches of Galatia, on the other hand, were being persuaded to adopt the Law. The circumstances are so radically distinct that a reference serviceable in the one case would be of no avail in the other. The Churches of Galatia were not anxious to be excluded from the sway of the Law of Moses, they were possibly being taught that the observance of that Law raised them to an equality with the Jews and thus made them complete Christians. To prove, by quoting the decree, that no Gentile Christian was bound by the Jewish Law would have served no purpose, and the mention of the four observances might but have strengthened the false views already current. Again, had Paul referred to the Congress and to its decision, he might have been supposed to subordinate his own authority as an Apostle to that of the Church of Jerusalem or to that of the other Apostles, and this he would avoid doing when the very question at issue was his title to be an Apostle. Once more, the doctrinal position maintained in the Epistle goes beyond the exact terms of the resolution of the Congress, or, at any rate, relates exclusively to the principle it embodied. To deny that salvation is obtained through obedience to the Law is to prove

that no enactments of the Law can be binding upon a Christian whether Jew or Gentile.

Again, the purpose of the decree is held to have been to secure the supremacy of the Jews within the Church, and to treat the Gentiles as on a lower grade than the Jews. This, it is said, Paul could not have tolerated. That Paul could not have tolerated such relations between Gentiles and Jews is unquestionable; but that the decree had any such intention or effect must be denied. Its aim, as has been shown, was to restore and preserve concord in the Church of Antioch, and to govern the relations between Jews and Gentiles in mixed Churches.

Finally, it is contended that the conduct at Antioch of those who came from James is inconceivable if the provisions of the decree had been in force. But this assertion, as will be shown, is based on a misconception of the motives and conduct of the messengers of James.

There is no reason then for the assertion that the decision of the Congress could not have been accepted by Paul. On the contrary, all that we know of his attitude alike to Jews and Gentiles renders it intrinsically probable that he welcomed the suggestion made by James, and regarded it as a happy settlement of the relations between the Jewish and Gentile Christians at Antioch.

Those who hold that the decree was not passed at the Conference, but who are at the same time unwilling to regard it as a simple forgery, have furnished

different explanations of its origin. It has been conjectured that a suggestion made by James at the Conference was altered by the author of the Acts into a decision by that body. James threw out the view that the Gentiles should practise the four abstinences mentioned, and this recommendation was converted by the author of the Acts into a formal decree. This hypothesis, however, bristles with improbabilities. To begin with, the action attributed to the author is dishonest. He is charged with conduct of which no man with any sense of truthfulness could be guilty. Again, why should the writer of Acts have falsified his materials in the manner alleged? What interest had he at heart which could be benefited by the insertion of the decree in the proceedings of the Conference? Further, would such a writer, after having created this imaginary decree, have limited its operation in the first instance to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia; then afterwards have allowed it to be delivered to the Churches founded before the Conference, leaving it unmentioned in all other cases, and nevertheless have made James refer to it years later as governing the relation between Gentiles and Jews? The supposition staggers belief. Equally incredible is the notion that the decree as it stands is fabricated, for few documents bear on their face such decisive tokens of genuineness. Its language exhibits striking affinities with that of the Epistle of James, and its substance is in the fullest harmony with the circumstances to which it applies. The tone and contents of the

document impress every reader by their naturalness. No competent judge will for a moment believe that the author of the Acts was capable of transforming a simple suggestion thrown out by James into the decree as it appears in the Acts.

There are those who are unwilling to reject the decree wholly, but who consider that it appears out of its place. The decree is a genuine article which came into the hands of the editor of the Acts without a date or any description of the circumstances under which it was enacted, and he sought to give it its proper position but went astray in his endeavour. This hypothesis obviously lies open to the most weighty objections. The essential fact is just the opposite of what is stated. According to the author of the Acts, at any rate, the date and the circumstances of the decree were known to him. Is his testimony false? Again, was such a document likely to come into his hands, without any explanation of its contents? Must not its date have been given, or the circumstances described under which it was promulgated? Even on the assumption that the decree passed into his hands in the condition supposed, is not his selection of the date as deserving of confidence as that made by any writer to-day?

It is instructive to examine the place to which the decree on this assumption has been assigned. According to one view, it was adopted some time after the Conference, when both Peter and Paul were no longer in Jerusalem. James and the majority of the Church

at Jerusalem, perceiving that the complete liberty bestowed on the Gentiles at the Conference imperilled the prerogatives of their race, enacted the decree in order to preserve for themselves the foremost place in the kingdom of God. Can any man believe that James and the majority of the Church of Jerusalem were guilty of such conduct, and that their guilt escaped detection until discovered by a scholar of our own times? No trace exists of any such action by the Church of Jerusalem. Had it taken place, would it not have been mentioned by Paul or by Luke? It occurred presumably before the Epistle to the Galatians was written. Why did Paul not refer to it?

But who can believe that it did take place? Were James and his fellow-members of the Church of Jerusalem capable of revoking of their own accord, and without any notice given to the other parties concerned, an engagement into which they had solemnly entered? Would they have done so without suggesting the terms of a new compact? Were they so foolish as to expect that ordinances passed by themselves would be accepted not only by Peter but by Paul and Barnabas and by the Church at Antioch, ordinances which, on the assumption in question, fettered the freedom of action already existing? But it is said that their desire in framing the decree was simply that the Gentiles should show some respect for the Mosaic Law. Was this, then, the temper of James and the majority of the Church of Jerusalem who are believed to have been zealots

for the Law? He would have been a poor zealot for the Law who was satisfied with such a recognition of its claims. To assign the decree to a later date than the Congress, on such imaginary grounds, merely to produce a result already gained by the place it actually occupies in the Acts, is absurd in no common degree.

Again, the decree has been assigned to a date subsequent to the discussion between Paul and Peter at Antioch (Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i. 214). The early Church refused to permit its members to meet the Gentile Christians at table, but were pledged by their agreement with Paul not to reject any who should profess the Christian faith. Hence they sought to solve the question, by getting the Gentile Christians, where they lived in contact with Jewish Christians, to submit to the conditions under which alone the scribes tolerated the presence of heathens on Jewish soil. The decree must be assigned to this date, because it furnishes no solution of the question raised in Jerusalem. It does not so much decide the belief to be held by the heathen in order to be Christians, as prescribe the customs they were to observe wherever they were brought into contact with Jews. This representation of the resolution of the Congress is inaccurate. The main question decided was that of principle. The Gentiles were not to be made subject to the Law of Moses. After the question of principle was settled, the relations of Jewish and Gentile Christians in the same Church

were considered, and it was arranged that the Gentiles should be required to observe the four prohibitions named. The language of the decision corresponds exactly to the circumstances under which the Conference was held. Again, the assertion that the question of the relation of Jews and Gentiles in mixed communities was not raised until Peter visited Antioch cannot be made good. Not only is it destitute of probability, but it is contradicted by the express statement of Luke in the Acts and also by the no less express statement of Paul in Galatians. Paul's entire narrative implies that Jewish and Gentile Christians met at table in Antioch. Could this have happened had the Apostles made it plain at the Congress that they did not permit the Jewish members of the Church to associate at table with the Gentile members? Apart altogether from the many difficulties connected with the promulgation and enforcement of the decree at the date named, the question occurs whether its contents are in harmony with the situation at Antioch, as conceived by the scholars who assign its origin to the date under discussion. The question was, How should Jewish Christians act towards Gentile Christians? Yet nothing is said in the resolution concerning the duties of Jewish Christians, nor are the Gentile Christians told that they might expect their Jewish brethren to mix with them on terms of equality, provided they conformed to the precepts given. Besides, it is generally held by the scholars in question that the

result of the dispute at Antioch was the formation of a wider gulf than ever between the two sections of the Church. Could such a decree as this have come into existence when the estrangement between the two branches of the Church was acute and growing?

Once more, the decree has been assigned to the last visit of Paul to Jerusalem. It is argued that the language of the Acts (21²⁵) shows that James is speaking of a conclusion which had just been reached. But there is not the vestige of a foundation for this view. Nothing in the language of James implies or suggests a reference to a recent event. His words are as readily understood of a decision come to ten years before as of one arrived at ten days previously. It cannot, indeed, be shown from Paul's letters, not even from First Corinthians (8 and 10) or from Romans (14) that Paul was acquainted with the terms of the decree; but there is no reason to reject the statement of the Acts that the decree was enacted at the Congress of Jerusalem. The writer of Acts, at any rate, is consistent in his references to the decision. The words he ascribes to James are an unmistakable allusion to the letter despatched by the Church of Jerusalem to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia.

The various endeavours, then, to find another place for the decree from that given it by Luke are altogether unsuccessful. They proceed on a misinterpretation of the terms of the decree itself, and

are incompatible with the authority rightly attaching to the testimony of the Acts and of the Epistle to the Galatians. Besides, if the Congress took place at all, the origin of the decree at any of the dates suggested is inexplicable.

CHAPTER VII.

THE "CERTAIN WHO CAME FROM JAMES" AT ANTIOCH.

NOT long after the Conference, as it would appear, Peter visited the Church at Antioch. The date has been disputed, and its settlement belongs more to the life of Peter than of James. An attempt has been made to show that Peter could not possibly have acted as he did at Antioch after the Conference, and that consequently the visit referred to must have preceded it. But this opinion is untenable. No reader of the second chapter of Galatians can fail to regard the incident at Antioch (2¹⁴) as subsequent to the Congress. The Apostle is obviously relating events in their chronological succession. A date several years after the Conference is not excluded by Paul's language, and has been favoured by many because they believe that the action of Peter can be more easily understood if it took place then. But this view, questionable in itself, must be rejected, because no evidence exists that Paul and Barnabas were ever together again at Antioch except on their return thither from the Conference. The visit paid by Peter to Antioch was

probably his first to that city. It has, indeed, been held that he may have gone there frequently; but this is improbable because of the tone of the narrative, which suggests that the visit in question was the first, and also because the circumstances in which Peter found himself are represented as novel. Had he been at Antioch before, he must have eaten with the Gentile Christians freely, and, if so, he could scarcely have been so readily intimidated by the emissaries from James. Peter was doubtless attracted to Antioch by what he had heard at the Conference, and possibly he believed that the interests of Christianity would be furthered were he to form the personal acquaintance of its members. Both the Jewish and Gentile branches of the Church would receive him gladly, as they cherished for him sentiments of trust and veneration. His frank and genial nature, the ardour of his convictions, his generous and sympathetic words, must speedily have made him a general favourite. He identified himself at once with Paul and Barnabas, and mixed as freely as they with the Gentile members of the Church. He ate also along with them, just as he had done many years before with Cornelius at Cæsarea. This action showed the interpretation which he put on the decision of the Conference, and expressed his deliberate conviction. It was not adopted on the impulse of the moment, but embodied the conclusion he had reached concerning the course which as a Jew he was bound to take in a mixed Church like that

of Antioch. The Gentiles were as truly Christian as himself, and therefore it behoved him to take his place beside them at the Feast of Love and at the Lord's Supper. That he acted from principle is plain not merely from Paul's assumption that their opinions were the same, but also from his statement that Peter lived after the Gentile fashion. This language cannot apply to a mere casual act or series of acts; it can only designate a line of conduct adopted with a full knowledge of its significance.

The happy and friendly relations between Peter and the Gentile section of the Church, as well as between its two branches, were rudely broken in upon by the arrival of certain persons from Judæa who are described by Paul as "certain who came from James." The import of this phrase has been keenly discussed, although its sense seems tolerably plain. The words cannot signify merely persons who came from Jerusalem, for this meaning is clearly inadequate. Whoever they were, they stood in a definite relation to James, and had not simply come from the Church of which he was a leading member. Equally erroneous is the opinion that the words designate adherents of James, members of a party of which he was the head. This interpretation, though not wholly inadmissible on grammatical grounds, does not commend itself in the present passage, is totally at variance with the testimony of Paul regarding the opinions of James, and is altogether uncorroborated by history. No body of men bearing the name of

followers of James, because of certain tenets or usages which he taught them, is known to have existed, and the James of the New Testament would have been the first to denounce such disciples. All that can be said, then, regarding the "certain who came from James" is that they stood in some connection with James, and probably bore a commission from him. It may be taken for granted that if their duty had respect to the relations between the Churches, the deputies did not belong to the party that had insisted on circumcision. The clear judgment of James would lead him to select for this purpose men who were not hostile to the sentiments and usages prevailing in Antioch. The exact nature of their mission cannot, however, be determined; and hence it is not plain whether they belonged to the more moderate or to the more extreme section of the Church. Accordingly the assumption so commonly made, that the emissaries brought a message to Peter from James is illegitimate. It is not even certain that they were sent by James at all, but it is far less certain that they were sent by him with a special message to Peter. In our ignorance it is unreasonable to hold that the messengers were despatched by James to learn whether the decision of the Conference was being carried out at Antioch, or to secure that the Jews and Gentiles should keep apart from one another. But it is still more unreasonable to assert that they were sent by James because he had heard that Peter

was associating freely with Gentiles, or because he felt that he might possibly do so. The opinion that James distrusted the conduct of Peter, and indeed disapproved of it, rests on a foundation of sand if based on the phrase "certain who came from James," even when coupled with their language and conduct; for there is no reason to think that they expressed the mind of James. Yet the assumption that they represented the sentiments of James, if they did not actually speak in his name, is maintained with such confidence and has gained such currency as to require some examination. A report, it is said, was carried from Antioch to Jerusalem, that Peter allowed himself free intercourse with the Gentiles, and James sent messengers to censure his conduct (Holsten, *Evang. Petr. und Paul.*, 357); or uneasiness was felt at Jerusalem regarding the possible conduct of Peter at Antioch, and James on this account despatched messengers there to caution him regarding his course. (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 81.) But is even this latter view probable, though coupled with the suggestion that complaint was made from Antioch as to Peter's behaviour? Is this representation of the action of James at all likely? Who would complain at Antioch of Peter's conduct? The Gentile section of the Church? This is out of the question. The Jewish branch? This seems contradicted by the narrative in Galatians. Further, would James have communicated his views regarding the conduct of Peter to messengers, by word

of mouth rather than by letter to Peter himself? Again, did James disapprove of Peter's conduct? Was Peter's action different from what James contemplated when proposing the restrictive clauses of the decision of the Congress? To answer these questions in the affirmative is to place an interpretation on the attitude and language of James unsanctioned by the testimony either of Paul or of Luke. It has been seen that James in proposing these clauses had the case of Antioch in view, and that the articles lose their significance and reality unless they were meant to unite the Gentile and Jewish Christians there and elsewhere in worship and fellowship. To believe that James, Peter, and John desired the formation at Antioch of separate Jewish and Gentile congregations is, in view of the history of the Church at Antioch and of Paul's statement in Galatians, out of the question. To assert that the thought of a Love Feast, at which both Gentiles and Jews sat down, was abhorrent to James, contradicts the testimony of Paul, that on the matter of principle James and he were substantially at one. If James expected, as he doubtless did, that his proposal would form the basis of Christian union, he must have anticipated that the Jewish section of the Christian Church should mix freely with the Gentile, provided the four conditions laid down were duly observed. He could not then have objected to Peter's doing what he allowed other Jewish Christians to do. What else could Peter

have done if there was to be genuine Christian fellowship and common worship on the part of the Christians at Antioch? Besides, would Paul have remained ignorant of the real cause of the defection of Peter and Barnabas; and, had he known it, could he possibly have omitted some reference to James and his deputies when condemning the conduct of Peter? If James had really instigated that conduct he must have changed his views: otherwise Paul could not have stated so decisively that Peter and James and himself were of one mind at the Conference. Accordingly, it must not be inferred, from the action taken by the delegates of James, that he disapproved of anything Peter had done or would do. Such an opinion would obviously require the strongest evidence in its favour, but evidence of any kind there is none.

The effect of the presence of the "certain who came from James" was most unfortunate. From the moment of their arrival they rigidly observed those usages to which they were accustomed, and refused to hold fellowship with the uncircumcised members of the Church. Whether they acted thus from force of habit and even of prejudice, or with the deliberate purpose of inducing the Gentiles to accept circumcision, is not clear. They may have followed their hereditary customs, without considering the bearing of their conduct on the relations between the Jews and the Gentiles within the Church; or, on the other hand, they may have sought, by refusing to eat with the Gentiles and by associating with the

Jews only, to persuade the Gentiles that it was an advantage to be circumcised. But not only did they observe the Law themselves; they apparently addressed themselves to Peter, and remonstrated with him as to the line of conduct he had taken. They may have asked why he should disregard the views and even the scruples of his fellow-countrymen. Why should he seem to make little of the Law? He was but a visitor in Antioch. Why should he live as if he were a resident there? Would not his disloyalty to the Law be heard of in Jerusalem and among the Jews? Would not this retard if not imperil the prospect of the conversion of their fellow-countrymen in Judæa? What hope would there be of bringing Jerusalem and Judæa to the Messiah, if he were known to renounce the observance of the Law?

It has often been said that the remonstrances of those who came from James were addressed in the first instance to the Jewish section of the Church rather than to Peter. Peter, it is held, yielded only when he perceived that the other Jews had lost their faith in the rightfulness of the conduct which they had hitherto followed. There is not a syllable to this effect in the narrative of Paul, nor is there the slightest probability that the delegates from James thought it expedient to approach the Jewish members of the Church at Antioch before approaching Peter himself. Did they know these members personally? Were they more likely to persuade them than Peter to adhere to their national usages? The language of

Paul points to Peter as the first object of their attack. It was his conduct with which they found fault. Whether they hoped through him to persuade the rest of the Jews to separate themselves from their Gentile fellow-countrymen cannot be learned. This point could be determined only if their view of the resolution of the Congress at Jerusalem were known to us. Now it is not said that they mentioned that decision. Its four precepts were doubtless observed in Antioch, and the visitors from Jerusalem would have no occasion to complain that the agreement arrived at had been departed from. Nor is there any evidence that they themselves insisted on the necessity of circumcision, or even called in question the free intercourse of Jews and Gentiles within the Church. They may even have interpreted the decision of the Congress as permitting common religious worship and fellowship between the Jews and Gentiles within the Church at Antioch. It is not necessary to hold that they found fault with anything except the action of Peter; he, they were convinced, should not have abandoned the customs which he followed in Jerusalem. Even in Antioch he should never have forgotten that he belonged to the Church of Jerusalem and not to that of Antioch.

The considerations urged by the delegates told powerfully upon Peter. Their evident disapproval filled him with anxiety and alarm. He probably recalled his experience at Jerusalem when his conduct in eating with Cornelius had been challenged, and was

unwilling to undergo fresh criticism and to create fresh dispeace within the Church. He may have judged it more expedient to defer to the wishes of the deputies than to the desires of the Church of Antioch. He never thought of imposing circumcision or any Jewish rite on the Gentiles, or of denying their essential equality with the Jews. He simply judged that it was wise for him under the circumstances to discontinue his social intercourse with them. The avoidance of this intercourse, the refusal to eat with uncircumcised Christians, did not appear to him to involve any question of principle. Accordingly, he withdrew from all fellowship with the Gentile section of the Church. He was followed in his defection by the rest of the Jews and even by Barnabas himself, perhaps the most striking proof of the force with which the current of Jewish prejudice was running.

A gulf now divided the Gentile from the Jewish section of the Church in Antioch. The separation seems to have extended even to the Love Feast and the Lord's Supper. But this was to destroy the very possibility of a common Christian life. It is probable that Peter, Barnabas, and the rest of the Jews did not apprehend the logical consequences of their new attitude towards the Gentile Christians. They did not discern either the speculative or the practical results of the course on which they had entered. They did not see that it led inevitably to the formation of two orders or degrees of Christians, a lower

and a higher; an arrangement wholly at variance with the views held by all Christians touching the nature and conditions of salvation. But what Peter and Barnabas failed to perceive, Paul with his usual rapidity and accuracy of judgment at once discerned. The question of principle settled at the Congress was virtually again at stake. The issue involved affected the very essence of Christianity. The refusal to associate with the Gentiles was the rejection and subversion of the truth as taught by Jesus. Accordingly, with whatever pain to himself, Paul determined to oppose and condemn the action of Peter. He did so apparently at a public meeting of the Church. He there charged Peter with dissimulation. By this he meant that Peter's withdrawal from fellowship with the Gentile converts was really inconsistent with his own principles. Alike at Cæsarea and at Antioch Peter had acted on the conviction that the Gentiles were no longer unclean. Why then should he suddenly change his mind and act as if they were unclean? Was not this virtually to compel the Gentiles to become Jews? The effect of the remonstrance of Paul is not mentioned by him, but there can be no doubt that Peter was convinced by it, and that he, and doubtless also Barnabas and the rest of the Jews, resumed their former relations with their Gentile fellow-Christians.

But how could Peter, in view of the resolution of the Conference, allow himself to act as he did? Did not the decision expressly provide that Gentiles and

Jews should hold religious intercourse on the conditions named? And if religious intercourse, why not social fellowship? Is it reasonable to hold that the emissaries from James would have borne with Peter had he merely sat at the Lord's Table with the Gentile Christians, but that they took offence at his freely mingling with them at their meals? Such a distinction is probable in itself and may have been accepted by them. Possibly, however, they may have objected to fellowship of any kind between them and Peter as at once uncalled for and dangerous.

But why did Peter when approached by them not appeal at once to the decision of the Conference? Whether he did so or not is unknown. But, even though he did, they might have answered that the determination referred only to the case of Christians belonging to mixed Churches, and not to persons in the position of Peter and themselves. It is not requisite, in order to explain their conduct, to assume that they repudiated the authority of the Congress; this they might have done, but there is no proof that they did so. They could even have construed the decision in the sense in which it was proposed and accepted, and yet have argued that it was not applicable to the case of Peter.

But how, in the face of the decision, could the rest of the Jews and even Barnabas have been led to renounce intercourse with the Gentiles? The explanation must be sought in the defection of Peter, whose example was contagious. The precedent of the fore-

most of the Apostles was the model which every Jew set himself to copy. They would not and could not desire to act otherwise than he did. If he saw fit to change his conduct, he must have adequate reasons for doing so. If he ventured to state the considerations of expediency which doubtless satisfied his own mind, the same considerations were to them decisive, weightier even than the judgment of the Conference itself. So far as they reasoned, it was but to conclude that the motives which governed Peter should govern them. Nothing was easier than for them, and possibly even for Barnabas, to argue that if Peter, in spite of the decision of the Conference, and in spite, too, of his own recent practice, should have seen cause to withdraw from social intercourse with the Gentiles, so too should they. The idea of disobedience to the terms of the decision of the Congress may not have occurred to them, or they may have regarded this disobedience as justified by circumstances.

But why is no appeal made to the decision, even by Paul himself? Why did he not confront Peter with the irresistible argument of the action of the Synod in which he had lately borne so eminent a part? Simply because he wields a still more potent contention. What was the determination of the Congress compared with Peter's own convictions and principles? It was to these and not merely to the decision of the Congress that Peter was disloyal.

Those scholars who hold that the decision of the Congress did not permit Jewish Christians to disregard

the Law, are accustomed to cite this incident at Antioch as a decisive proof of their view. How, they ask, could the delegates from James have succeeded in persuading Peter to renounce social intercourse with the Gentiles except on the ground that such intercourse was not contemplated, but rather excluded by the findings of the Conference? But this opinion, however specious, labours under greater difficulties than the opinion which it assails. Were not Paul and Barnabas Jewish Christians? Was it intended that they should adhere rigidly to the Law, and so abstain from social and even religious intercourse with their Gentile fellow-Christians? Would Paul and Barnabas have accepted such an arrangement? Would such an arrangement have been welcomed with joy by the Church at Antioch? Again, is it not clear from the account of Paul (Gal 2) that Peter on arriving at Antioch found Paul and Barnabas and their Jewish brethren eating freely with their Gentile brothers? Did, then, all the Jewish Christians at Antioch as well as Paul and Barnabas misconceive the purpose or disobey the terms of the decision? Further, Peter, when just arrived from Jerusalem, acted as Paul and Barnabas did. Is it conceivable that he instantly violated a statute which he had just been engaged in passing?

Again, it has been held that the incident at Antioch can be explained only on the assumption that the decision of the Conference merely allowed such intercourse between Jews and Gentiles as was permitted

by the Jews between themselves and those adherents of the faith known as the fearers of God (Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, 335). These were allowed to enter the Synagogue and take part in the worship; but the privilege of sitting down at table with the Jews was not conceded to them. The Congress of Jerusalem imposed the same restrictions on intercourse between Jews and Gentiles within the Church as the Synagogue imposed on intercourse between the Jews themselves and the men of foreign birth who attached themselves to the Jewish faith. The strict legalists who came from James did not reject the claims of the Gentiles to be full members of the community, or decline religious fellowship with them. They simply refused to sit with them at table, on the ground that such conduct would have been a violation of their duty towards the Law. Paul, it is said, does not condemn the delegates from James, but simply condemns Peter. But there is no evidence that the four restrictions enacted by the council governed the intercourse in the Synagogue between the Jews and those foreigners who adhered to the Jewish religion without becoming proselytes. It would seem that no definite requirements were exacted, the relation between them and the Jews having many degrees of closeness. At any rate, the specific rules to which they conformed, if they existed at all, have not come down to us. Nor is there any likelihood in the suggestion that the Christian Church, in order to determine the relations between Jews and Gentiles in Christ, borrowed the

regulations of the Synagogue. As has been shown already, such a view is incompatible with the language of James in proposing the four restrictions. Nor is it credible that the leaders of the Church, and more particularly Paul, would have recognised it to be the duty of Jewish Christians to persevere under all circumstances in their allegiance to the Law. Paul himself was a Jewish Christian, and regarded himself as bound by the decision of the Convention. On this interpretation of its decision it would have been his duty, on his return to Antioch, to set up two independent Christian congregations, for the intercourse involved in the Love Feast and the Lord's Supper was defiling in the eyes of a strict Jew. It is unreasonable to hold that James, Peter, John, and Paul did not foresee that an arrangement, whereby the Gentiles should have conceded to them only the same measure of fellowship as the Jews conceded to the Gentiles adhering to the Synagogue, was utterly impracticable and even self-contradictory.

It is now time to examine the assertion that the narrative of the Conference at Jerusalem renders the incident at Antioch impossible. The dispute at Antioch is held to disprove the historical character of the decision, whether in the form of a regular decree or not. The decision made it possible for Jewish and Gentile Christians to associate with one another at meals. James, then, and his followers had no reason to take offence at Peter's eating with Gentile converts (*Encyc. Bib.* i. 924).

This argument would be conclusive if men were always governed by logic. Undoubtedly the decision of the Congress, interpreted in the spirit in which it was made, sanctioned the line of action taken by Peter. It does not, however, follow that this consideration was plain to all, and that those who came from James must necessarily have admitted its force, particularly in the case of Peter. It was open to them to argue that the determination of the Congress did not apply to Peter or to themselves, who did not belong to the Church of Antioch but to the Church of Jerusalem. They may have contended that mere visitors like themselves should not follow a course that would create dispeace in the Church of Jerusalem, and certainly retard the extension of Christianity among the Jews. It was also possible for them to maintain that the intercourse implied by the decree did not extend to fellowship at table. Peter, it would seem, had not restricted his intercourse with the Gentiles to religious fellowship, including the Love Feast and the Lord's Supper. He seems to have gone further, and to have accepted social invitations from Gentiles. Again, the delegates from James might conceivably have set at nought the decision of the Congress. They might have condemned it as unwise, and refused to be bound by it. To infer from the incident at Antioch that the account of the Conference is untrustworthy, is consequently unreasonable. But the complete refutation of this opinion is found in the language of Paul himself. His description of Peter's conduct

shows that Peter held the principle that Jews and Gentiles should associate at table. He charges Peter with being false to his own convictions. This charge would have had no meaning unless Peter had felt himself at liberty to mix freely at meals with his Gentile fellow-Christians. This implies that, so far as Peter himself was concerned, those who came from James could not reproach him with abandoning his convictions. Peter was urged to act against his conscience, and under the influence of fear actually did so. This demonstrates that Peter before the incident at Antioch had come to the conclusion that he was entitled to hold social intercourse with Gentile Christians. It is a great though common error on the part of many writers to fix their attention solely on the demand made by those who came from James, and to argue that that demand must have represented the convictions of James and even the convictions of Peter. The slightest attention to the language of Paul shows what Peter's convictions really were, and there is no reason for believing that the convictions of James were other than the convictions of Peter. No conclusion, therefore, adverse to the historical character of the Congress of Jerusalem can be drawn from the dispute at Antioch.

CHAPTER VIII.

JAMES AND THE LAST VISIT OF PAUL TO JERUSALEM.

THE next mention of James is associated with Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, which took place at the Pentecost of 58 (57). It was with a resolute though foreboding heart that Paul approached the city which he loved so deeply, but where he knew himself to be the object of relentless hate. He was carrying his life in his hands, and his arrest was imminent. A short time previously a plot had led him to alter his route to escape assassination, and but a few days before he had heard from the lips of the prophet Agabus at Cæsarea the announcement of his arrest and imprisonment. Nor was he confident as to how he would be received by the Christian Church in the city. Peter, his closest friend among the Apostles, was apparently no longer there; and none of the Twelve, it would seem, was in the city at the time. James the brother of the Lord was still the head of the Christian community, and he could reckon on his sympathy and approval. But many who bore the Christian name regarded him with distrust; for their minds had been poisoned against

him by calumny, and he was doubtful as to their attitude. He did not feel sure that even the generous gift that he had raised by such persistent efforts among his converts in Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia would be received in the spirit in which it was offered. But no shadow of doubt as to the wisdom of his course fell on his spirit; for he realised that it was of the highest moment to the interests of Christianity that the Church of Jerusalem and the Gentile Churches should be knit together by confidence and love, and it behoved him to do all he could to remove from the minds of the Christians of the metropolis any false opinions they held touching his own principles and conduct, or the sentiments and mode of life of his converts. Whether he and his fellow-travellers from Caesarea entered the city so as to shun observation as much as possible (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 106), cannot be determined. But the reception which he met with the first evening must have dissipated his fears at least for a time. The next day, accompanied by the delegates in charge of the contributions from the different Gentile Churches, he met with James and the elders of the Jerusalem Church. The interview was public and official. Paul had doubtless intimated to James his intention to present the collection, and to rehearse what he had done on his late journey; and James in turn had summoned the elders to receive Paul and his fellow-deputies, and to hear the account of his labours. Nothing is said as to the feelings either of Paul or of James and the

elders on the occasion. Hence there has been diversity of opinion respecting these. Yet the account of the Assembly in Acts is hardly susceptible of more than one interpretation. It has, indeed, been suggested that, according to the narrative of Acts, Paul had to plead his cause before the elders in Jerusalem just as at the Congress. But this is a caricature of Paul's position. He appears in the narrative as a Christian missionary whose labours had been crowned with extraordinary success, and whose efforts could not but obtain the praise and gratitude of all Christians. Nor is there the slightest reason for holding that the meeting was lacking in cordiality and warmth. The personal friendship between the two leaders may be accepted as a proof of the sentiments actuating their followers. Just as little plausible is the conjecture that some of the delegates, such as Timothy and Trophimus, gazed trembling on James and his fellow-elders, and began to doubt whether as Christians they really were emancipated from the Law of Moses. There is not a hint that any of the companions of Paul felt excessive timidity in the presence of James or the elders. Why should they have done so? Was James to them a greater man than Paul? Were they more influenced by his appearance or language or views than by Paul? What was there in the bearing or speech of James or of the elders to strike awe into the beholder or the hearer? There was dignity of speech and of manner, but the etiquette, the ceremonies, the display, the splendour, which are the common

sources of emotion on such occasions, were altogether wanting. The nature of the reception extended to Paul and his fellow-missionaries is plainly indicated by the statement that James and the elders, after hearing Paul's account of his labours, glorified God. Doubtless the first act of Paul was to introduce the delegates from the different Churches, who would place at the feet of James and the elders the contributions made with so much self-sacrifice towards the support of their poorer Christian brethren in Jerusalem and Judæa. This liberality was not only a sign of the gratitude felt by the Christian Churches for the mission of Paul, but also a proof of the brotherhood existing between them and their Jewish fellow-believers. The narrative in Acts does not mention the presentation of the gift, and hence the conclusion has been drawn that it was received thanklessly and grudgingly. Such an inference from the silence of the writer is obviously illegitimate and inconsistent with the sentiments attributed to James and his fellow-elders. To argue that Luke would certainly have mentioned that the gift was gratefully received, had such been the case, is gratuitous; for his silence on the whole subject seems to show that he did not regard the gift as of critical importance. He may even have shared Paul's view of its consequence, but have omitted to mention it, seeing it stood in no necessary relation to the Apostle's arrest and imprisonment, the topic with which as a historian he was engrossed. After the collection had been laid at the feet of James

and the elders, Paul related the events which had marked his life during the last few years. The narrative was listened to with great interest, and excited much gratitude and praise. His hearers were men of quick Christian sympathies, and the story of the progress made by their faith caused their lips to overflow with thanksgiving to God.

After the elders had conveyed to Paul the assurance of the joy with which they had heard of former churches confirmed in the faith and new churches founded, the conversation turned on his presence in the capital. His arrival could not remain unknown. His fellow-Christians attended the Feast in thousands, and the news would soon pass from lip to lip that he was in the city. The intelligence would fill them with indignation and hatred, because they believed the calumnies propagated regarding him. A report was industriously and habitually spread among them that he taught the Jews throughout the world to revolt from Moses, to leave their children uncircumcised, and to abandon their ancestral customs. (Rendall, *Acts, in loc.*, holds that Jews and not Jewish Christians are here spoken of.) Accordingly they suggested that he should associate himself with four of his Jewish fellow-Christians who had taken upon themselves a Nazirite vow, and should bear the cost of the sacrifice they had to offer, and so enable them to complete their vow. The effect of such conduct would be that the charge made against him would be proved groundless, and it would be known to every-

one that he kept the Law. The action suggested would not infringe in the least the principle that the Gentiles were emancipated from the Law of Moses, for this was already secured by the decision of the Conference. That decision stood in all its force, and the Gentiles had only to guard themselves from what was sacrificed to idols, from blood, from what was strangled, and from fornication. (Wendt, *Apostelgesch.*, following Schürer, regards this verse [Ac 21²⁶] as an interpolation; but his reasons are unconvincing.)

The views of the elders were probably stated by James. Their language proves how malignant was the hatred cherished towards Paul by his Jewish fellow-countrymen. Intense as was their scorn of Christianity, it was multiplied a thousandfold by the form which Christianity took in the teaching and life of Paul. Nor is it improbable that even Jewish-Christian lips had carelessly or of set purpose misrepresented his attitude and language towards the Jewish Law, for the hostility entertained towards him burned fiercely in the breasts of some who bore the Christian name. The accusation was false, but there was much in the convictions and conduct of Paul that gave it a semblance of truth. He did not preach circumcision. He mixed freely with Gentiles, and even ate at their tables; and his example was followed by many Jews. Whether any of his adherents had gone the length of not circumcising their children is unknown, but many of them must have neglected

traditional usages to an extent which in the eyes of a rigid Jew appeared as apostasy.

The language of the elders bears witness to the wide diffusion of Christianity in the Holy Land. Even though not taken literally, it proves that a considerable body of converts to the Christian faith had by this time been made. The devotion of these converts to the Law is not surprising: its absence would rather have been a cause for astonishment. Living as they did in the Holy Land, they were naturally zealous for the Law which they had inherited, and their conversion did not lessen their attachment to it as of divine origin. They doubtless regarded it as binding on all Jews, Christians included. But that they held its observance to be a condition of salvation is not stated, and must not be taken for granted. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the majority even of Jewish Christians, however high the veneration which they cherished for the Law, did not in any sense treat obedience to it as a means of salvation.

The proposal made to Paul was one the fulfilment of which was regarded with peculiar favour by the Jews. No higher proof, whether of piety or of beneficence could be given than to charge oneself with the cost of the sacrifices which had to be made by a Nazirite before his head could be shaved and absolution from his vow obtained. Accordingly, such action on the part of Paul would be unmistakable evidence of his attachment to the Law and of his liberality

towards his poorer fellow-countrymen and fellow-Christians. The suggestion was at once accepted and immediately carried out. Seven days had to elapse until the four Christians whose obligations he had assumed could be released from their vow. Whether he had to spend these days along with them in one of the chambers of the Temple is not clear, but, at any rate, on one of these days, possibly the fifth (Lewin), he was in the Temple in the Court of the Women, when some Jews of Ephesus recognising him, charged him falsely with polluting the Temple by bringing Greeks into it. A tumult arose, and his life would have been sacrificed had not the Roman soldiers in the Tower of Antonia rescued him from the populace.

What view is to be taken of the counsel given by the elders? Does it imply that they distrusted Paul? Is it virtually an admonition? Would James himself never have given it? Must he be regarded simply as acquiescing in it, but as preferring that it had never been made? There is nothing in what is related of the elders to show that they themselves entertained any suspicion as to Paul's attitude towards the Law. And it is hardly probable that in view of their past knowledge of him they could have done so. James could not have failed to inform them of his real sentiments and aims. Nor is it at all likely that within the circle of the eldership in Jerusalem there were men whose conception of Christianity differed essentially from that of Paul or James. Had any

such been among the elders, they would hardly have been satisfied with the demand actually made. The Jewish-Christian party, in the strict sense of that term, contended that every Gentile should be circumcised. Their gravest charge against Paul was that he did not insist on the observance of the Jewish Law. Nor can it be believed that James took a different view of the suggestion made to Paul from that taken by the elders. It is true that the advice is given in the name of the Assembly and not in James' own name. But this does not prove that the advice was unpalatable to James, or that he himself would not have given it. He was probably the spokesman of the elders, and it is impossible to hold that he did not express his own sentiments quite as much as those of others. Coming from himself the advice would have been weighty, but it was rendered still more weighty as the counsel of all the rulers of the Church.

But was the advice worthy of James? Was it such as became him to give and Paul to follow? It has been said (*Farrar, St. Paul*) that the suggestion made was humiliating to Paul, and the Apostle has been described as associating for seven days in a chamber of the Temple with four paupers, and as standing among them while burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, peace-offerings, and wave-offerings were being made in which his heart had no place. But there was no humiliation to a Jew in the observance of such ritual acts, and the obligations undertaken by Paul were of the most honourable kind. If, then, there

was humiliation at all, it must lie in the advice itself. Was it unbecoming on the part of James to make such a request to Paul? Should he rather have thanked him for his eminent services to the cause of Christ, informed him of the deadly peril to which he was exposed, and urged him to quit the city immediately? What had occurred to lead James to give, or Paul to receive, such advice? Had not Paul come up deliberately to Jerusalem with the fullest knowledge of the danger he ran? Was it not evidently his intention to remain for some time in the city? Did he not mean to mix freely with the Christians there? If his presence in the city was necessary to the accomplishment of his purpose, how could he remain concealed? Moreover, the suggestion made by James and the elders was at once wise and expedient. The end contemplated was of the highest importance and urgency: the union of the two great branches of the Church, the Gentile and the Jewish. Nothing was more desirable than that Jewish Christians should understand and admire the character and labours of Paul. The falsehood of the charges brought against him could best be shown by a decisive act, and the acceptance of the obligation suggested would clearly prove that he was no apostate animated by hostility to the Temple and to Moses, but a man who cherished reverence for the great lawgiver and the customs he had enjoined.

It is argued, however, that James could not honestly have proposed and Paul honestly acceded

to the suggested arrangement. James knew well that Paul did not keep the Law, and Paul could not have been guilty of the hypocrisy of pretending to keep it. But this objection proceeds on an erroneous view of the advice given to Paul. James did not ask Paul to prove that he habitually observed the Law. He was perfectly aware that Paul was not in the habit of doing so among the Gentiles, for it would have been impossible for Paul to act as a missionary to the Gentiles and yet obey the Law. It must also have been obvious to him that a single act of conformity was no evidence of a man's usual conduct. What he desired was that Paul should prove by a decisive instance that the accusation brought against him of disloyalty towards the Law or repudiation of its obligations was calumnious. To defray the charges of certain Nazirites was a crucial illustration of his veneration for the Law, and therefore of the baselessness of the allegation that he taught the Jews to apostatize from it. Without the greatest inconsistency and hypocrisy he could not have associated himself with men under a Nazirite vow and at the same time have taught the Jews of the Dispersion to give up circumcising their children and observing the Mosaic rites. The language of James, it is true indeed, admits not only of this, but of an opposite interpretation. This interpretation, however, is not only required by the context, but by all that is known alike of Paul and of James. What Paul then was asked to do was to indicate in an

unmistakable manner his sympathy with and reverence for the Law of Moses, and this he could not for a moment hesitate to do. He was a Jew, and never ceased to think, feel, and act as a Jew. He no longer believed that the Law could justify, and nothing would persuade him that it could accomplish this end. Accordingly he felt at liberty to depart from its precepts in fulfilling his duty of evangelizing the world; associated freely with Gentiles, and accepted their hospitality without question. But there is no evidence that he abandoned all Jewish customs, or that when among the Jews he did not live with the same strictness as they. His antagonism to the Law was only in so far as it was made a condition of salvation. To Jewish usages in themselves he had no objection, and he gladly conformed to them when occasion arose. He could properly speak of the curse of the Law, and pronounce the gospel of the Judaizers no gospel, and even rebuke Peter for following Jewish practices, because the question raised on these occasions was one of principle. But at the same time he frequented the synagogue, he attended the Jewish feasts, he circumcised Timothy, and he probably himself took a Jewish vow at Cenchreae. Accordingly, the counsel was one which James could suitably give and Paul suitably follow.

Granting all this, however, may it not be said that for Paul to comply with the request of James was to expose himself to the charge of abandoning his principles as the Apostle of the Gentiles? Did he

not lay himself the more open to accusations from the Judaizers whom he had stigmatized as 'false brethren,' 'false apostles,' 'dogs,' and the 'concision.' It must be allowed that Paul's act could be so misunderstood. But this construction would be put upon it only by his enemies, not by his friends or by impartial judges. No candid mind could possibly misconceive his motives. A false statement as to his teaching had been industriously disseminated. He was represented as a habitual apostate from the Law, and as persuading others to be apostates. Such a calumny could be best disproved by a public act of conformity to a usage peculiarly Jewish; and the wisdom of the Apostle taught him that the suggestion made by James was eminently judicious. He knew that the charge made against him was false both in the letter and in the spirit. From irreverence towards Moses, from disloyalty towards his ordinances, he felt himself absolutely free. He could with as clear a conscience as the strictest Jew associate himself with his fellow-Christians who had taken the Nazirite vow. There was nothing in his principles, nothing in his life, that rendered the suggestion of James and the elders in any way offensive to him. Instead of looking with aversion or disfavour on the duty proposed, he regarded it with a friendly eye. To take part in the rites and ceremonies prescribed was to him no painful, but rather a joyful experience.

These observations prove that the censure repeatedly passed on the action of James and Paul on

this occasion is altogether baseless. Both of them have been charged with deferring too much to Jewish superstition, and with virtually taking part in acting a lie. Such accusations betray grave intellectual and not less grave moral incapacity. It is true that the argument in question is intended to discredit the narrative, and to prove it altogether untrustworthy. But if the narrative be trustworthy, what then?

This incident is commonly described as the crowning proof of James' devotion to the Mosaic Law. It is regarded as the evidence of an attachment to that Law altogether surpassing that exhibited by Peter or John. But what is spoken of is not the zeal of James for the Law of Moses, but the zeal of the Jewish Christians. They undoubtedly were hostile to any movement that seemed to abrogate the Law. Its usages they conceived to be binding, although they could hardly, as intelligent Christians, have regarded the obligation as moral. It is quite possible also that James shared the view that Jewish Christians should continue to observe the Law, and that he statedly acted on this conviction. But it does not follow that he was in any sense a legalist, that is, a person attaching a special or excessive value to the fulfilment of the ritual and ceremonial prescriptions of the Mosaic Law. To attribute zeal of this kind to James, is to believe that he possessed a most limited insight into the spiritual nature of Christianity as the true fulfilment of Judaism. But his Epistle, his speech at the Synod, and the testimony of Paul

(Gal 2), establish beyond dispute how clear and profound was his knowledge of the essence of Christianity, and how completely he realized that the salvation it offered was independent of all ritual or ceremonial observances. That the author of the Epistle of James and of the speech at the Synod could have been a zealous upholder of the Law, in the sense in which the Pharisees or even the ordinary Jews were such, may be pronounced impossible. At most, then, James can but have faithfully complied with the precepts of the Law as usually observed. But that he attached a moral significance to their observance or zealously promoted it cannot be admitted. At any rate, the conclusion that he did so is not to be drawn from the incident before us, and can hardly be reconciled with the tone and contents of his Epistle and his speech.

The true nature of the relations between James and Paul appears from this interview between them. They had met several times, and were therefore conversant with one another's characters and convictions. James would never have ventured to ask Paul to co-operate in a Nazirite vow, had he supposed that such conduct was in the slightest degree inconsistent with his principles. For it may be taken for granted that no man, and much less James, could have possessed any degree of intimacy with Paul without recognising that he was stable as a rock in all cases where principle was in question. James, then, must have been aware that Paul did not teach that the Jews were emanci-

pated from the Law in the sense that it was incumbent upon them to discontinue the practice of circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath and of the great festivals, and their other characteristic usages; but that, on the contrary, he himself was still, as far as consistent with his vocation as an Apostle of the Gentiles, a Jew in spirit and in conduct. There was no schism between Paul's intellect and his heart. Love did not prevail over wisdom. The obligation he fulfilled was no act distasteful and repellent, characterized by mental reservations or qualifications, and still less a repudiation of his principles and his past history, but a step taken with a clear conscience and in a cheerful and grateful temper.

What now was the effect of Paul's compliance? Did it fail to accomplish its end (McGiffert, *Apos. Age*, 343)? The historian, as so often, does not describe the issue, but leaves it to be inferred. Accordingly, there are those who pronounce the action of James and Paul as unwise because it did not achieve the result intended. But that Paul was arrested and imprisoned is no indication that what James and he sought to accomplish remained unfulfilled. It is quite possible that he gained the confidence of not a few of his Jewish fellow-Christians by his action. There is certainly no evidence to show that the opposite was the case. Besides, the wisdom of an act is not always to be judged by its immediate effects, and who can tell what the final issue of the step taken by Paul in compliance with the suggestion of James proved to be?

CHAPTER IX.

THE LAST DAYS OF JAMES.

A DESCRIPTION by Hegesippus of the mode of life followed by James, and of his death, has been preserved to us by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 23). It is as follows (McGiffert's translation):—

“James, the brother of the Lord, succeeded to the government of the Church in conjunction with the Apostles. He has been called the Just by all from the time of our Saviour to the present day; for there were many that bore the name of James. He was holy from his mother's womb; and he drank no wine or strong drink, nor did he eat flesh. No razor came upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil, and he did not use the bath. He alone was permitted to enter into the Holy Place; for he wore not woollen, but linen garments. And he was in the habit of entering alone into the Temple, and was frequently found upon his knees begging forgiveness for the people, so that his knees became hard like those of a camel, in consequence of his constantly bending them in the worship of God, and asking forgiveness for the people. Because of his exceeding great justice he was called the Just, and *Oblias*, which signifies in Greek

‘Bulwark of the people’ and ‘Justice,’ in accordance with what the prophets declare concerning him. Now some of the seven sects which existed among the people, and which have been mentioned by me in the *Memoirs*, asked him, ‘What is the gate of Jesus?’ and he replied that He was the Saviour. On account of these words some believed that Jesus is the Christ. But the sects mentioned above did not believe either in a resurrection or in one’s coming to give to every man according to his works. But as many as believed did so on account of James. Therefore, when many even of the rulers believed, there was a commotion among the Jews and Scribes and Pharisees, who said that there was danger that the whole people would be looking for Jesus as the Christ. Coming, therefore, in a body to James they said, ‘We entreat thee, restrain the people; for they are gone astray in regard to Jesus, as if He were the Christ. We entreat thee to persuade all that have come to the Feast of the Passover concerning Jesus; for we all have confidence in thee. For we bear thee witness as do all the people, that thou art just, and dost not respect persons. Do thou therefore persuade the multitude not to be led astray concerning Jesus. For the whole people, and all of us also, have confidence in thee. Stand, therefore, on the pinnacle of the Temple, that from that high position thou mayest be clearly seen, and that thy words may be readily heard by all the people. For all the Tribes, with the Gentiles also, are come together on account of the Passover.’ The aforesaid

Scribes and Pharisees therefore placed James upon the pinnacle of the Temple, and cried out to him and said: 'Thou just one, in whom we ought all to have confidence, forasmuch as the people are led astray after Jesus, the crucified one, declare to us what is the gate of Jesus.' And he answered with a loud voice, 'Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus the Son of Man? He Himself sitteth in heaven at the right hand of the great power, and is about to come upon the clouds of heaven.' And when many were fully convinced and glorified in the testimony of James, and said, 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' these same Scribes and Pharisees said again to one another, 'We have done badly in applying such testimony to Jesus. But let us go up and throw him down, in order that they may be afraid to believe him.' And they cried out, saying, 'Oh! oh! the just man is also in error.' And they fulfilled the Scripture written in Isaiah, 'Let us take away the just man, because he is troublesome to us: therefore they shall eat the fruit of their doings.' So they went up and threw down the just man, and said to each other, 'Let us stone James the Just.' And they began to stone him, for he was not killed by the fall; but he turned and knelt down and said, 'I entreat thee, Lord God our Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' And while they were thus stoning him, one of the priests of the sons of Rechab the son of the Rechabites, who are mentioned by Jeremiah the prophet, cried out, saying, 'Cease, what do ye? The just one prayeth for you.'

And one of them, who was a fuller, took the club with which he beat out clothes and struck the just man on the head. And thus he suffered martyrdom. And they buried him on the spot by the Temple, and his monument still remains by the Temple. He became a true witness, both to Jews and Greeks, that Jesus is the Christ. And immediately Vespasian besieged them."

To determine the value attaching to this narrative is of the greatest importance. The testimony has generally been accepted, and the common representation of James as a man of rigid and ascetic piety rests upon it and on the additions made by Epiphanius when incorporating it in his *Panarion*.

What inference should be drawn from the fact that this description of James has in a sense become the common possession of the Church? Is it to be taken as fresh evidence of the uncritical and even credulous temper existing in Christian circles, or is it to be regarded as proof that there is no real contradiction between the portrait drawn in the New Testament and that drawn by Hegesippus? Neither of these deductions is altogether valid. The alleged temper and its opposite belong not to one body of men or to one age, but to all men at all times. Both tempers coexist, though now the one and now the other gains the ascendancy in particular spheres of thought and action. If there has been much credulity exhibited within the Church, there has also been exhibited excessive scepticism. Nor is it the case that the

James of Hegesippus and the James of the New Testament are two likenesses of the same person, for the divergence between them is too great to allow of their being pronounced copies of the same original. Hence arises the necessity of testing carefully the account of Hegesippus.

But how is this examination to be conducted? Is it legitimate to select from the narrative the portions which appear credible and to set them down as established? Is it permissible to separate them into groups such as 'genuinely Christian,' 'universally Israelitish,' 'Nazirite,' 'Essene,' and 'priestly,' and to accept at once some of these as trustworthy because no objection can be raised against the possibility of their being true? May it be taken for granted without discussion that James was continually occupied interceding for the forgiveness of Israel because a prayer of this kind would be natural and appropriate on his lips? (Lechler, *AT*, i. 60). To proceed in this manner is plainly wrong, because it is to confound the possible and the probable with the actual and the certain. The account, provided its texture is uniform, must be accepted or rejected as a whole.

The weightiest objection to the narrative is its incompatibility with what is related concerning James in the New Testament. As this incompatibility is not commonly recognized or admitted, it is necessary to indicate some of the inconsistent features. The James of Hegesippus is an ascetic, probably a Nazirite,

perhaps even an Essene. No Nazirite or Essene practices are attributed to the James of the New Testament. An Essene or even a Nazirite, as has been already shown, he could not have been. Nor could he have been the James delineated by Hege-sippus. Who can believe that the James of the Acts and of the Galatians and of the Epistle professing to be his, the brother of Jesus, the friend of Peter and of John, of Paul too and Barnabas, who was convinced that the Gentiles were exempt from the Mosaic Law, and who proposed the terms on which Jews and Gentiles in mixed Churches should meet together for common worship, terms which involved the partial abandonment of the Law by Jewish Christians, who was almost certainly married, who performed the many and laborious duties connected with his high position in the Church of Jerusalem, was at the same time a severe ascetic and formalist, refusing to drink wine, or eat flesh, or use oil, wearing linen garments only, and found continually on his knees in the Temple? Was this the type of piety which commanded reverence in the Church of Jerusalem, a type alien to the spirit and example of Jesus, and not less alien to the convictions and habits of the Jews? Was such a man likely to have been called to preside over the Church in the capital? Was such a man likely to commend Christianity to his fellow-citizens and fellow-countrymen? Is the popularity among his Jewish fellow-countrymen so generally ascribed to him, a popularity based on his zeal for the law,

consistent with habits some of which were hostile to the Law? Without hesitation it may be said that the James of Hegesippus could never have acted as the president of the Church of Jerusalem.

A close and detailed examination of the narrative of Hegesippus confirms this result. James is represented apparently as a Nazirite; but, as has been shown, there is no evidence from Scripture to prove that he was such. On the contrary, any evidence which exists points unmistakably in a contrary direction. It has indeed been contended (Lechler, *AT*, i. 64) that the advice given by James to Paul when he went up to Jerusalem for the last time, implies that James had taken upon himself Nazirite obligations. But this conclusion will commend itself to no one. It is further stated that James did not eat flesh. This assertion cannot be true if he conformed to the ordinary standard of Jewish orthodoxy, for every loyal Jew partook of the Paschal lamb. Again, it is said that he alone was permitted to enter the Holy Place. Whether by this is meant the Holy Place or the Holy of Holies is not clear. But under any circumstances the privilege assigned to him is wholly at variance with Jewish legislation, for the high priest alone was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies, and the priests alone to enter the outer sanctuary. The assertion that he wore linen garments only is not more credible, for it is evidently intended to place him on an equality with the priesthood or even above it, as the priests were bound to

wear such garments only when exercising their sacred functions. The statement that he was in the habit of entering alone into the Temple, if that term is to be understood in its widest sense, is inconsistent with the fact that its doors stood open throughout the day, and that it was constantly visited by worshippers. If, on the other hand, it refers to the Holy Place, it assumes that James was of priestly descent, or that a unique privilege was conceded to him, suppositions which are baseless. The writer was evidently ignorant of the structure of the Temple and of its modes of worship. It is further related that James was called by the designations '*Oblias*' and '*Justice*,' in accordance with what the prophets declared concerning him. The passage is obscure and probably imperfect, but its statements seem purely imaginary. No prophecies relating to James are contained in Scripture, and the most ingenious scholars have found it difficult to specify any that may be applied to him. The titles '*Bulwark of the people*' and '*Justice*' or '*Righteousness*' doubtless represent two Aramaic or Hebrew words. But were such designations likely to have been given to James by Christians? Again, the seven sects are spoken of, and these are said to have believed neither in a resurrection nor in a future judgment. Yet this assertion is obviously erroneous. The Pharisees unquestionably believed in a resurrection and in a judgment, and the only sect known to have rejected these truths is that of the Sadducees. Again, the writer speaks of the Jews and Scribes and

Pharisees. What is the import of this phrase? The Scribes and Pharisees were certainly Jews. In what sense were the Jews opposed to them? The explanation which at once occurs, namely, that the Jews are the great body of the people as opposed to the Scribes and Pharisees their leaders, cannot be adopted because of the context, where the people as such are opposed to the Jews and Scribes and Pharisees. It is therefore evident that the writer had no clear conception of the different elements constituting the Jewish people. Again, the request addressed to James by the Jews and Scribes and Pharisees is incredible. He is asked to restrain the people because they had come to believe that Jesus was the Christ. It is inconceivable that such an appeal should have been made by the leaders of the Jews to the leader of the Christians. The Jewish authorities knew perfectly what the views of James were, and to suppose that they could, with that knowledge, confess their confidence in him and ask him to declare to them the 'gate of Jesus,' that is probably whether the teaching of Jesus was or was not false, is out of the question. The utter absurdity of this proceeding is made more plain by the circumstance that James has already been represented as having proclaimed Jesus to be the Saviour, and as having induced a number of Jews to accept Him as the Christ. The narrative is here an inexplicable tangle.

Equal incredibility attaches to the account of his death. The placing him on the pinnacle of the

Temple is evidently a fiction derived from our Lord's temptation. The proposal made by the Scribes and Pharisees to go up and throw him down and then stone him is also purely imaginary. The words put in the lips of James are simply copied from our Lord's words on the Cross (Lk 23²⁴). The intervention of one of the priests of the sons of Rechab is a feature of which no satisfactory account has been given, and which perhaps can be best explained by confusion of thought on the part of the writer.

Other objections might be mentioned, such as fresh inconsistencies and the obvious imitation of passages of Scripture. But those just stated are sufficient to show how utterly untrustworthy is the whole narrative.

This conclusion is confirmed by the view generally entertained regarding the source from which Hegesippus derived his information. The opinion is now common among scholars that one of his authorities, possibly his principal authority, was the *Ascents of James*. This work is known through a description of it by Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30. 16, 25), though doubt has been expressed whether that Father had ever seen the book (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 152). But the title he mentions and his statements representing its contents render it highly probable that a portion of the First Book of the *Clementine Recognitions* (55. 71. 73) was taken from it. It is there said that a certain enemy, after James had persuaded the high priest and the people to receive baptism, raised a tumult and

attacked him, and threw him down headlong from the steps of the Temple, and believed that he had perished. Three days later, the Apostles received secret information from Gamaliel that his enemy had been sent by Caiaphas to Damascus to persecute and destroy the Churches, and more especially to take Peter, who was supposed to have fled thither. The passage in the *Recognitions* has apparently been softened; for the work, as read by Epiphanius, described Paul as a Greek born in Tarsus, who fell in love with the daughter of the high priest and accepted circumcision in order to obtain her hand, but failing to do so wrote against circumcision and the Sabbath and the Law. The coincidences between this portion of the *Recognitions* and the account of James in Hegesippus are striking, and suggest at once that the *Ascents of James* is the common source of both writings. It has been conjectured with much likelihood that the narrative of Hegesippus formed the close of the work, the earlier portions of which are preserved in the *Recognitions* (Lightfoot, *Galatians*). The title of the book is probably taken from the Stairs of the Temple which James ascended to address the people. Whether Hegesippus had this book in his hands or only borrowed from it indirectly must remain undetermined. The *Ascents* were evidently an Ebionite fabrication in which the character of Paul was drawn in the darkest colours, and assertions made concerning the events of his life utterly opposed to known facts. Hence any extracts from it are

destitute of value. If, then, the *Ascents* formed the sole or principal authority on which Hegesippus depended, no reliance can be put upon his description as historically true. But are the *Ascents* his sole authority? The question is not easily answered, and perhaps cannot be satisfactorily answered. It is improper to take for granted without examination that the *Ascents* were his only source of information, for he may have had access to other sources. At the same time, the latter alternative seems excluded by the uniform tenor and substance of the narrative of Hegesippus, which appears to proceed from a single pen. It is hard to believe that so many erroneous assertions could have been made by different writers and then combined into a whole by Hegesippus. It is much more probable that he simply related what he found in a single authority.

That Hegesippus held the account he gives of James to be true, and that he found no difficulty in accepting it, must be admitted. This is certainly an argument in favour of its authenticity; but, on the other hand, it is negatived and destroyed by the character of the statements he makes, which have been shown to be incredible. There is no cause for surprise that Hegesippus should accept apocryphal stories regarding James, for such statements are freely accepted by writers of far higher distinction.

Such is the account of the death of James given by Hegesippus. It is, as we have seen, largely if not wholly legendary, and must therefore be rejected.

How stands the case with the second account, that of Josephus? The narrative of the historian is in substance as follows:—*Antiq.* xx. ix. 1: The younger Annas or Hannan had just been raised by Herod Agrippa to the high priesthood. Festus the procurator was dead. Albinus his successor had not yet arrived. Herod Agrippa was absent, probably with the army of Corbulo. Annas was a Sadducee, and a man of bold and cruel temper. He seems to have cherished a hereditary hatred towards the Christians, and he saw at once that an excellent opportunity of taking vengeance on the abhorred sect was open to him. Accordingly, he resolved to strike down their most prominent leader, together with a number of his followers. He convened a meeting of the Sanhedrin, and had James and some others condemned for transgressing the Law, and ordered to be stoned. The historian evidently implies that James and his fellow-Christians perished by this sentence. In the course of his narrative Josephus speaks of James as "the brother of Jesus the so-called Christ, James by name." Not a few writers (including even Zahn, *Einleitung*, i. 76; *Forsch.* vi. 301) are of opinion that these words are an interpolation. But the passage bears the imprint of genuineness. No Christian would have spoken of the so-called Christ. Nor would he have related the execution of James in such cold passionless language. If Josephus were to refer to the death of James at all, he could hardly have spoken otherwise. Further, the difference of tone regarding

James between the present passage and that commonly regarded as spurious quoted by Eusebius (*HE*, ii. 23), furnishes additional evidence of its originality. There is, then, no reason for regarding the words referred to as added to the original text, and the entire narrative may be accepted as authentic. Being the witness of a contemporary and in a sense even of an enemy, it is raised beyond all suspicion.

The charge made by the high priest against James is described by the general term 'breach *or* transgression of the Law.' But how, it may be asked, could such an accusation be made against one whose highest distinction was his observance of the Law? How could the high priest persuade the Sanhedrin to condemn a man for violation of the Law who was pre-eminent for his observance of its precepts? Why, above all, did the reputation of James not protect him with the Pharisees? Did they refuse to join in his condemnation? This can hardly be believed, because the session of the court at which James was condemned must have been formal. There is no reason to hold that the verdict did not represent the deliberate judgment of the whole body. This being so, it is plain that the Christians were an object of aversion, not to say hatred, alike to the Pharisees and Sadducees. Their belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, the worship they offered Him, the assertion that He was about to return in judgment, made them detested by both sects. Doubtless, too, their disapproval of resistance to the Roman arms would tend

still further to estrange the Pharisees from them, while their affirmation that Jesus had risen from the dead must have been a constant grievance to the Sadducees. It would not, then, be difficult for so astute and daring a man as Annas to procure from the Sanhedrin the condemnation of James and of other Christians. The indictment against them was probably that of blasphemy. Nothing was easier than to show that the language of the Nazarenes regarding Jesus and the worship they offered Him as the Son of God amounted to this crime. James the Christian was never lost in the Jew, and he may have given Annas occasion for action by his vigorous defence of the Messianic claims of Jesus, and by his condemnation of every mode of life other than the Christians. The Sanhedrin, aware that the sect of the Nazarenes cherished convictions and ideals quite at variance with their own, would not hesitate at the instigation of Annas to condemn James and his fellow-Christians to death. They were sentenced to be stoned, and this fact confirms the view that blasphemy was the charge brought against them. It is not stated where the sentence was accomplished, but James, like Stephen, was probably put to death outside the city.

The conduct of Annas was disapproved of by a moderate party among the citizens of Jerusalem, and complaint was made both to Albinus and Herod Agrippa, with the result that the king removed him from office after only a three months' tenure. It

has often been held that this intervention was due to sympathy with James and admiration for his sanctity. But it is doubtful whether this inference, so grateful to the Christian, is valid. There is no trace in the language of the complainers that they were moved by any regard for James and his fellow-victims. They did not even affirm that the Christians suffered unjustly. Their complaint related solely to the illegal step taken by Annas of executing a capital sentence which was not confirmed by the procurator.

What was the year in which James was executed? The statement of Josephus on the subject points conclusively to the year 62.¹ The condemnation and sentence took place in the interval between the death of Festus and the entrance on office of his successor Albinus. Now Albinus was in Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles in 62 (Josephus, *BJ*, vi. v. 3). Whether he had only then begun his administration is not clear: he may already have been a short time in office. But that the interval between his assumption of power and the Feast of Tabernacles was brief, is evident from the circumstance that the news of his appointment as successor to Festus only reached Jerusalem at the Passover in April (Josephus, *Antiquities*, xx. ix. 1). If James was put to death, as is commonly held, at one of the great Festivals, he must have been executed either close to the Passover or to Pentecost. The Passover is commonly preferred, in view of the statement of Hegesippus

¹ Cp. Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, lxxx. and p. 328 at 1938.

(Eusebius, *HE*, ii. 23); but this date, while highly probable, cannot be regarded as settled because of the doubt attending the entire narrative of Hegesippus. It may even be questioned whether the death of James took place at any Festival. On or before such occasions criminals were frequently executed, doubtless with the view of giving greater publicity to their fate. But whether any such motive weighed with the younger Annas is uncertain. His policy seems to have been to procure the condemnation of James before the arrival of Albinus. If this were so, it is not necessary to hold that he would await the approach of a Festival in order to have the sentence carried out then. The account of the proceedings of Annas suggests that James was suddenly arrested, tried, condemned, and executed; and it is possible that this action may have coincided with the date of one of the greater Festivals, but the alternative that it did not is equally open. Annas was in office for only three months, and the dates of his accession and removal cannot be fixed with precision. It is possible that he may have been appointed sufficiently early to allow of his having had James put to death before or immediately after the Passover of 62. Not less probable, however, is the supposition that the condemnation of James may have taken place in the interval between the Passover and Pentecost. Whether James, then, was put to death shortly before or after the Passover of Pentecost of 62 cannot be decided.

It is natural that writers who consider the passage in Josephus relating to the death of James to be an interpolation, should prefer the date suggested by the narrative of Hegesippus. The language of Hegesippus admits of different interpretations, and hence even those scholars who accept his testimony are not unanimous as to the date which must be assigned to the execution of James. The year 66, shortly before the outbreak of the Jewish War, is favoured by many, while others again ascribe it to the year preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, namely 69, which is the date given in the *Paschal Chronicle* (ed. Bonn, i. 460). Hegesippus brings his account of the death of James to an end with the words, "And immediately Vespasian besieged them." Further, Eusebius himself regards the siege of Jerusalem as having taken place immediately after the martyrdom of James, and intimates that this was also the view of Josephus (*HE*, ii. 23). Elsewhere, too, he states (iii. 11) that the conquest of Jerusalem followed immediately upon the martyrdom of James. Josephus and Hegesippus are evidently the authorities on which Eusebius rests, and the statement of Hegesippus points either to 66 or 69. That it does not indicate the latter year exclusively may be regarded as certain. The siege of Jerusalem was undertaken by Titus, not by Vespasian; and though the language of Hegesippus might be understood of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, it finds a still more suitable explanation in the siege and conquest of such towns as Jotapata,

Gamala, and Thabor. To insist that the adverb 'immediately,' as used by Hegesippus, can only designate an interval of a few months is preposterous. On the whole, then, the language of Hegesippus may be regarded as applying to the year 66 or 69.

The narrative of Hegesippus, however, is not absolutely inconsistent with that of Josephus. There is nothing to forbid the account in Hegesippus to be understood of an interval of three or four years. Even though James were put to death in 62, Hegesippus might readily have traced a connection between that event and the origin of the Jewish war in 66, and have spoken of one of these as immediately preceding the other. Under any circumstances, the year 62 is to be preferred. The testimony of Josephus, besides being that of a contemporary, is precise. The other possible but less probable dates are 61 and 63. Eusebius himself in the *Chronicle* assigns the martyrdom of James to the seventh year of Nero, namely 61, while Jerome in his edition puts it in the eighth, namely 62 (McGiffert's *Eusebius*, 127).

James, according to Hegesippus, was buried near the temple, on the spot where he was put to death ; but this statement is at variance with the Jewish custom of burying the dead beyond the walls of the city. Accordingly, it has been suggested that James was cast from the verge of a precipice on Mount Moriah into the gorge beneath (Stanley's *Apostolic Age*), and buried there among the rocks of the Valley of

Jehoshaphat. As, however, the whole narrative is legendary, there is no need to show how he might have been cast from the battlement of the Temple into the Valley of Jehoshaphat. Tradition in the time of Jerome made the place of burial the Mount of Olives (*de Vir. Illust.* 2).

The cavern or grotto of St. James shown to travellers to-day (Baedeker's *Palestine*) is not the supposed tomb of James, but the place where he is said to have lain hidden, tasting no food, between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. This tradition dates from the sixth century.

According to Hegesippus, a Pillar or Monument of James existed in his time; and there is no reason to call this statement in question. It might well be that the Christians in Jerusalem raised a memorial to their first and greatest ruler. The date of the erection of the monument is uncertain. It certainly cannot have been built immediately after the death of James, for it is scarcely probable that the Christian community would have ventured or been permitted to do so, and any such monument must have been destroyed in '70. It might have been put up by the Church after the return from Pella, and in this case it would have been erected by Jewish Christians; but it is difficult to believe that such a monument would have been spared by Bar-Cochba. Hence it may be inferred that the monument of which Hegesippus speaks was probably erected after Jerusalem had ceased to be a Jewish city. The monument, then, must have been

built by the members of the Gentile Christian Church established in the city. Nor is such a step on their part surprising, for there is no reason to believe that the Gentile Christian Church held any other views than its predecessor, the Jewish Christian Church. There was no discontinuity between the one Church and the other, for both alike were Catholic.

As late as the time of Eusebius (*HE*, vii. 19) the Episcopal Chair or Throne of James was shown in Jerusalem. (According to Zahn, the same fact is attested for the time of Timæus, bishop of Antioch 270-280, by Gregory Barhebraeus.) That the chair spoken of was believed to have been used by James admits of no doubt. But that the belief was baseless admits equally of no doubt. Did James possess any such chair? Was this chair a bishop's throne? Did the Christians who withdrew to Pella carry it with them? Did they bring it back again? Was it carried away with them when they fled before the pitiless hatred of Bar-Cochba? Was it borne back once more by those Christians who chose to settle in the capital, now known by the name of Aelia Capitolina and become a Gentile city?

The belief that an ancient chair in Jerusalem was the original chair of James is an evidence that his memory was cherished among the purely Gentile community. Some chair of considerable antiquity was preserved by the Christians, and the legend grew up that it was the chair of James. Not the slightest trace of any superstitious reverence for the chair

appears in the account of Eusebius. The care with which the chair was kept was to him a memorable sign of the reverence of the Church of his own and earlier times for eminent piety. But it was nothing more.

CHAPTER X.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL POSITION OF JAMES.

IT has been shown already that the narrative of Hegesippus regarding James is so confused and self-contradictory as to be incredible. But the account could not have been written had James not occupied a great, if not the first place in the Christian community of Jerusalem. Besides Hegesippus, the only testimony regarding James and his position entitled to be examined is that of Clement of Alexandria and of the Clementine literature. Clement in the Sixth Book of his *Hypot.* (Eusebius, *HE*, ii. 1) relates that Peter and James and John after the Resurrection of the Saviour were not ambitious of honour, though the preference shown them by the Lord might have entitled them to it, but chose James the Just bishop of Jerusalem. In the Seventh Book he adds that the Lord after the Resurrection delivered the Gnosis to James the Just and John and Peter; these delivered it to the rest of the Apostles, and the rest of the Apostles to the Seventy of whom Barnabas was one (Lightfoot's translation in his *Galatians*). The conclusion has often been drawn from the second of these passages that Clement represents James as the

cousin of our Lord ; but the only valid inference is that he believed him to be an Apostle. The expression "the rest of the Apostles" implies that James the Just was also an Apostle. It does not, however, follow that Clement believed him to be one of the Twelve. He might have held him to be an Apostle without including him in the group of the Twelve. That he did consider him to be our Lord's brother is established by a fragment of the *Hypot.*, preserved in a Latin translation by Cassiodorus, in which Jude is expressly spoken of as the brother of James and the son of Joseph, and our Lord's own brother. Had it not been for this statement, it might have been argued that Clement identifies James the Just with James the son of Alphæus as the second James among the Twelve. But this view cannot be defended in the face of the quotation just given, and is excluded by the absence of any reference to it in the works of Origen and Jerome, where, if it had been the opinion of Clement, it would almost certainly have been discussed.

But if Clement is right in his opinion that James was the brother of our Lord, his other statements are clearly wrong, for they are inconsistent with the entire tenor of the New Testament. It is impossible with the New Testament in our hands to believe that Peter, James, and John chose James to be bishop of Jerusalem. Up to the year 44 at least, Peter is the most prominent figure in the history of the Church of Jerusalem, and is entitled to be called its bishop,

should that designation be applied to anyone. If Clement derived his information from any authority, the source on which he depended was wholly untrustworthy. He perhaps, however, expresses only his own opinion, and that opinion was naturally coloured by the ecclesiastical arrangements existing in his own time.

The assertion of Clement, that James was chosen bishop of Jerusalem by the three Apostles, may simply have been an opinion of his own. On the other hand, it may have descended to him from tradition, or he may have found it in some other author. However this may be, his statement regarding the communication of the Gnosis by our Lord most probably rests on some written or unwritten authority. We know from Hippolytus (*Hæc.* x. 6) that the Naasenes regarded James as the agent through whom certain communications had been made to Mariamne, from whom they in their turn had received them. The Mariamne spoken of was probably Mary of Magdala. Substantially the same assertion is made in Origen (*c. Celsum*, v. 62). Its source is probably to be found in the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, which is known to have been used by the Naasenes. The origin of this Gospel can hardly be later than the middle of the second century; but there is no reason to believe that its contents possess any historical value.

The name of James occurs frequently in the Clementine literature, and the position assigned to him is one of exceptional dignity. His is the greatest

personality in the Church. He is as much the chief bishop of the Christian Church as Caiaphas is the chief priest of the Jews (*Recog.* i. 68). No teacher is to be believed unless he bring from Jerusalem a testimonial from James the Lord's brother (*Recog.* iv. 35). Every Apostle, teacher, or prophet must be shunned who does not compare his teaching with that of James (*Homilies*, xi. 35). James is the lord and bishop of the Holy Church (Letter of Peter to James). He is the bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem the Holy Church of the Hebrews and the Churches founded by the providence of God (Letter of Clement). In the whole of the Clementine literature he appears as superior to the Apostles themselves, and as the supreme doctrinal authority of the Church.

It is evident that none of these statements is of the slightest historical worth. They are found in works which are pure fabrications, and which are distinguished by their total disregard of history and chronology. At most they show the light in which James was regarded by certain sectaries in the beginning of the third century. It is true that the editors or compilers of these different writings must have made use of other works in making their own: they doubtless merely adapted to their purposes books already in existence. But the nature and number of these works can hardly be ascertained with accuracy. There is, however, much probability, as we have seen, that one of these was the *Steps* or *Ascents of James*. The later chapters of the First Book of the *Recognitions*

differ from those that precede, and evidently embody statements derived from another source. The story of Clement has been incorporated in an older document, and this document was probably the *Steps* or *Ascents of James*. It has, indeed, been argued (Salmon, *Dict. of Biog.*) that the author himself indicates a different source for this part of the work. The last chapter of the third book of the *Recognitions* describes the contents of the ten books sent by Clement to James as consisting of the discourses delivered by Peter at Cæsarea. The seventh of these books dealt with the things which the Twelve Apostles treated of in the presence of the people in the Temple. The ten books referred to must evidently be distinguished from the *Recognitions* themselves. Whether they ever existed is open to question; but, if they existed, their date can hardly be placed much earlier than the *Recognitions*. If the books mentioned were actually written, it is possible that the seventh book was that from which the editor or author of the *Recognitions* drew his materials. But this conclusion is not at variance with the view that the *Steps* or *Ascents of James* may have been worked up in our present *Recognitions*. It is quite true that the seventh book of the alleged discourses of Peter at Cæsarea cannot be identified with the addresses delivered by James from the Temple steps. The one work apparently consisted of discourses by the Apostles, the other of discourses by James alone. Besides, to the author of the *Recognitions*, at any rate, and probably therefore

to the author of the book of Peter's discourses also, James is the bishop of Jerusalem and not an Apostle. But, though this is true, the *Steps* or *Ascents of James* may nevertheless be the basis on which the later chapters of the first book of the *Recognitions* ultimately rest. These later chapters describe a public discussion between the Apostles and the Jewish authorities to which they had been challenged by the high priest. First the high priest, then the Sadducees, then the Samaritans, then the Scribes, then the Pharisees, then the disciples of John are refuted, and all the people are told that Jesus is the eternal Christ, and are solemnly warned to receive the Son of God before the Twelve disciples should go forth to the Gentiles. The discussion is resumed the next day, and the Apostles are accompanied to the Temple by James the bishop and by the whole Church. James then proceeds to answer certain questions put by Caiaphas, and through seven successive days persuades the people and the high priest to hasten to receive baptism, and they are on the point of doing so when an enemy of the Christian Faith enters the Temple and cries out, "Why are you led headlong by most miserable men who are deceived by Symeon a magician?" The result is a tumult in which that enemy attacks James, throws him headlong from the top of the steps, and leaves him for dead. James is lifted up, carried to his house where the night is spent, and the next day the Christians, five thousand in number, depart for Jericho.

This narrative of the death of James reminds us at once of the account of Hegesippus. The principal difference between them is that, according to the *Recognitions*, James was cast down from the Temple steps; while, according to Hegesippus, he was cast down from the pinnacle of the Temple. If, as is probable, the *Steps* or *Ascents of James* existed before Hegesippus wrote, he may have derived his account of the death of James directly or indirectly from it. Different traditions regarding that death may have reached him, and it is possible that he sought to combine these into a single whole. It has been acutely pointed out (Lipsius, *Apok. Apost.* ii. 242) that, according to Hegesippus, an endeavour was made to put James to death in three different ways: by casting him down from the Temple pinnacle, by stoning, and by beating with a club; and that these attempts indicate a combination of different legends. It is possible that the most ancient account related that he was cast down from the steps of the Temple and stoned to death. The conjecture, then, that the description of the attempt on the life of James in the *Recognitions* is derived from the *Steps* or *Ascents of James* is not incredible. It is true that the legend of the *Recognitions* is a fragment belonging to a work which related the struggles between Peter and his enemy, who is undoubtedly Paul. But the *Ascents of James* may have dealt with similar materials, or may, as we have seen, have been made use of in this later work. There is nothing opposed to the view

that the *Steps of James* reported addresses which he delivered from the Steps of the Temple and his subsequent martyrdom, and contained, therefore, essentially the same legend which Hegesippus relates. Whether the foul charges against Paul mentioned by Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxx. 16) were derived from the same source, must remain undecided.

This examination shows that nothing of historical value regarding James is to be found in the statements of Clement of Alexandria or of the Clementine literature, and it is needless to refer to later works. All subsequent writers are indebted to Josephus and Hegesippus, and frequently combine their materials in the most arbitrary and erroneous way. Eusebius had access to no other authorities, and the account of Epiphanius appears, except where it evidently reproduces Hegesippus, to be purely imaginary. This may even be the case with the date of the martyrdom, which he assigns to the year 57, when James was ninety-six years of age; although it is not less probable that this date is drawn directly or indirectly from some written source. Jerome's account is confused and erroneous, and is evidently a compilation from Josephus, Hegesippus, and Eusebius.

James is commonly described as the bishop of Jerusalem. This is the title usually applied to him in Christian writings, and it can be traced back to the middle of the second century. He is generally regarded as the earliest instance of a bishop. But was he a bishop in anything approaching to a strict

sense of the term? Did he discharge any functions peculiar to himself? Was he other than a member of a corporation? No weight can be attached to the designation 'bishop' universally applied to him by antiquity, for the Ignatian Epistles prove that the bishopric as an institution existed long before the time of Hegesippus, who is apparently the first to speak of James as the bishop of Jerusalem. The question then is this, Are we warranted by the Scripture evidence in regarding James as a bishop in the special meaning of the word? It is argued that the position assigned to him in the Acts and in Galatians proves that he occupied a unique station, practically identical with that filled by a bishop of later times. Peter, when about to quit Jerusalem, asks that the news of his safety should be reported to James and to the brethren. James presided at the Congress in Jerusalem, and seems to have dictated its resolutions. Paul, when giving an account of the transactions of the Congress, mentions his name before those of Peter and John; and when visiting Jerusalem for the last time in 58 is formally received by James as the representative of the local Church. These instances, it is alleged, establish the conclusion that James was the bishop of Jerusalem. But there is a wide gulf between these premises and the inference drawn from them. Even if the premises were admitted, the inference would not follow. All that is said concerning James could be true without his position being different from that of the ordinary

presbyter. The premises, moreover, are to some extent doubtful. No argument can be drawn from Peter's desire that his escape should be mentioned to James and the brethren, except that James was prominent in the Church. The statement that he presided at the Congress is debatable, and the assumption that he did is therefore unwarranted. That his name occurs before those of Peter and John in the Epistle to the Galatians (chap. 2) may be merely accidental, and is certainly no basis for the conclusion that he took precedence over Peter and John in the Church of Jerusalem. The mention of his name when Paul visited the capital for the last time shows, indeed, his high position in the Church there; but the fact that the presbyters are stated to have been present with him hardly supports the view that his position differed essentially from theirs.

For if James was bishop of Jerusalem, when was he raised to the office? Why is no account of his elevation found in the Acts? Was he bishop when Paul visited the city for the first time after his conversion? If so, why did Paul repair thither to visit Peter rather than James? Why did he not, under any circumstances whatever, go to visit both Peter and James? Again, if he was not bishop till 44, the year of the death of James the brother of John, why does his name not appear when Paul and Barnabas somewhere about this date brought the gifts of the Church of Antioch to Jerusalem? Why,

too, is it absent when the formal reception of the delegates from Antioch by the Church of Jerusalem is related? (Ac 15⁴). Why are the Apostles and elders alone mentioned and not the bishop? Further, if he were bishop and framed the decree, why is not his name inserted in it? Why is the decree spoken of (Ac 16⁴) as ordained by the Apostles and elders, while the name of the bishop is passed over? These considerations show that it is impossible to ascribe to James a position independent of the Apostles and elders. He may have been the Chairman of the eldership or presbytery, raised to that dignity because of his eminent personal gifts; but there is no trace of his having discharged functions that could not be performed by any other member of the body. Nothing suggests that his authority stood higher than that of the Apostles and presbyters, and that the latter were merely his advisers. On the contrary, this view seems refuted by the fact that he is never designated 'bishop,' and that his name is not mentioned in connection with the reception of the delegates from Antioch and with the publication of the decision of the Congress.

That James was the most prominent figure in the Christian Church of Jerusalem, and exercised as such a wide and penetrating influence, need not be disputed; but just because he is never called bishop in the New Testament, because no notice of his being raised to the office is found there, and because no such functions as are commonly associated with a bishop

are ascribed to him, it is improper to designate him bishop of Jerusalem.

It has been sought to show that, while James was not bishop of Jerusalem in the sense in which the term is applicable to the bishop of a Gentile community, he was nevertheless a bishop. He and his successors in the see of Jerusalem till the time of Hadrian are instances of Jewish Christian bishops, all other bishops being Gentile Christian. The peculiarity of the Jewish Christian bishop was that he was conceived to be a successor of the Lord, not a successor of the Apostles. Hence James is addressed as 'lord,' and government and discipline and not teaching are regarded as the essential attributes of his office. Hence, too, the transmission of his office to the relatives of Jesus must be understood as the temporary continuation of the lordship over the Kingdom of God belonging to the Messiah, and which He will assume at the Second Advent (Ritschl, *Alt. Kirche*, 416). This description of the episcopate of James is admittedly drawn from sources which are not absolutely historical. Our Lord, it is allowed, did not commit to James the government of the entire Church, and it is clear from the Acts that he was not the representative of Christ and the chief ruler of the community. Though the roots of the episcopate in the Jewish Christian community go back to its earliest days, nevertheless that episcopate was not founded by Christ.

But had the Jewish Christian bishops any real

existence? Were James and the bishops that followed him in Jerusalem chosen as the successors of Jesus, and therefore necessarily His relatives? The passage from Hegesippus on which Ritschl bases his view that James was chosen to rule over the entire Church in the place of Jesus (Eusebius, *HE*, ii. 23) is probably only intended to state the unquestionable fact that in conjunction with the Apostles he took a leading part in managing the affairs of the Church. The idea that James, according to Hegesippus, took the place of our Lord is a mere fantasy.

The testimony of the Clementine writings, which make James the lord and bishop of all Christian communities, has been shown to be valueless. Nor is it the case that Symeon was chosen to succeed James because he was related to our Lord. This point will be fully discussed immediately: meanwhile it may be said that this is not the only possible sense of the words, and is, in truth, a meaning excluded by the facts related. No hint is anywhere given that the authority of James passed as such to Symeon. It is merely stated that Symeon succeeded James as bishop of the Church at Jerusalem. Still less can the conclusion be drawn from the list of bishops of Jerusalem given by Eusebius (*HE*, iv. 5) that the same official character which belonged to James and Symeon as relatives of our Lord belonged to them likewise. Had Eusebius believed that the fifteen bishops whose names he records were all related to our Lord, he would almost certainly have mentioned

so striking a fact. Nothing in his pages suggests that he held these bishops to be our Lord's kinsmen. Further, why should this view of the bishopric have ceased when Jerusalem became a Gentile city? Might it not have been expected to perpetuate itself among those Christian Jews who continued to observe the Law? Yet no trace of such an office is known to have existed. Nor is it the case that the peculiarity of the Jewish Christian bishop consisted in his being a representative of our Lord. Was Ignatius a Christian Jew?

The view, then, that James was the first of a series of Jewish Christian bishops whose attributes differed essentially from those of Gentile Christian rulers of the same name, rests on no solid basis. The James of authentic history was not a bishop; but, if James was not a bishop, what was his position? Was his rank peculiar to himself? It has lately been contended that, while no trace of episcopacy can be found in any trustworthy documents which describe the Church of Jerusalem, because the episcopate is an institution of Greek origin, the position of James within the Church corresponds to the position of the high priest as president of the Sanhedrin. The council of the elders which surrounded James and over which he presided was, we are told, modelled on the Sanhedrin of which the high priest was chairman (*Réville's Origines de l'Épiscopat*). But no evidence in support of this opinion can be produced. Not a word or phrase can be quoted from the New Testament tending to show that the Christian Church ever

regarded James or any of its rulers as occupying the same position within the Church as the high priest did within the Sanhedrin. Nowhere is the eldership compared with the Sanhedrin, or its chairman with the high priest. What possible motive could have induced the Christians to frame their mode of government after that of the supreme court? Were there priests and lawyers and nobles among the Christians? If the high priest presided in the Sanhedrin by virtue of his office, why is his Christian representative not called by the same title? Is it credible that any Christian ruler would have been spoken of as the true high priest? Would this language have become the lips of Christians who believed that Jesus was the sole High Priest? Is it credible that a usage so absolutely opposed to the Epistle to the Hebrews ever obtained currency in Jewish Christian circles and then vanished without leaving the faintest impression of itself? It is pure illusion to suppose that the primitive Church of Jerusalem saw in James its high priest the brother of the Messiah, the heir of His rights, the ruler appointed to govern the community of the Messiah until the Second Advent. The appeal so often made to the existence of the relatives of Mohammed is no true parallel, for not a syllable in the New Testament suggests that our Lord's relatives were intended to succeed Him as the supreme authorities and even high priests of the Church. This point will come up for fuller examination immediately.

The question whether James was an Apostle has already been discussed in some measure, and it has been shown that he is probably called such by Paul when speaking of an incident which falls not later than 37-39. But the term 'Apostle' was employed by Paul in a comprehensive sense to denote Christian workers to whom we never apply the name, and hence the designation of James as an Apostle hardly throws any light on his position in the Church; for it is not easy to ascertain from Paul's language what was the function of an Apostle, how he was appointed to office, and what was his measure of authority within the Church of Jerusalem. Information fails us as to whether James was known in Jerusalem as an Apostle; but there is nothing improbable or incredible in this supposition, because Paul is likely to have followed general usage, and because the term 'Apostle' was used with considerable latitude in Jewish Christian Churches as well as in Gentile circles.

If, however, James did not belong to the number of the Twelve, and if he did not occupy a unique position analogous to that of a bishop, must he be described as an elder? This would seem to follow from the circumstance that the Decree of the Conference ran in the name of the Apostles and elders as well as that of the Church. And, as James was not included among the Apostles, he must almost certainly be included among the elders. It is some corroboration of this view that he appears along with the elders on the occasion of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, and

speaks as it were in their name. The most obvious interpretation of the relation between James and the elders is that he was their spokesman or chairman. Nor is there any contradiction between the conclusion that he was an elder or presbyter and the statement of Paul that he was an Apostle. For the same person could be at once an Apostle and an elder.

It has, however, been denied that he held any official position in the Church. No evidence exists to show that during his lifetime there was any regular governing body in the Church of Jerusalem. Neither the Apostles nor the elders constituted any such body, and James consequently occupied no official position.

This opinion, however, cannot be accepted. There must have been some government in the Church of Jerusalem, and this government was largely directed by James. The phrase 'official position,' when applied to the first century, is uncertain in its meaning. But if it be taken to signify known and acknowledged authority, a title to command, then it may be asserted that James held official rank within the Church, and that he ruled at least over the Christian congregation at Jerusalem in conjunction with the elders.

For the elders of Jerusalem seem to have been a body entrusted with the government of the Church. They were not merely the older Christians. It cannot be shown that age was ever in itself a standard or criterion in the Apostolic Church, and that men solely on account of their years were designated as elders or

presbyters. Besides, age is itself an ambiguous term in this connection, and may designate either length of years or length of Christian experience. There is no proof that the title of elder or presbyter was merely one of honour, used to designate the aged members of the community; and, even on the assumption that it was a designation of honour, its use cannot have been indiscriminate. Wherever men are united for any object, some form or mode of government becomes necessary. This is true of the Church as of other institutions. From the very first it required some guides, rulers, authorities. These it had in the Apostles. But government was not their special task, and soon the need of providing for the fulfilment of certain duties springing out of the economical arrangements of the Church led to the appointment of the Seven. As far as our information extends, the Twelve and the Seven were the only authorities in the Christian community till the first persecution. It is possible that, when the Church was reconstituted after this event, the office of the elder was introduced. The form it took was doubtless suggested by the existence of the eldership among the Jews; yet it was none the less a natural growth. The office was called for by the needs of the Church, and was specially adapted to these needs. The Christian elder differed in several respects from the Jewish elder, for his functions related exclusively to the spiritual interests of which he was the guardian.

The existence of elders in the Church of Jerusalem

at so early a date has been impugned (Weizsäcker and McGiffert deny the existence of elders in the first age). Christians still continued to worship in the Synagogues and to frequent the Temple. Would not the formation of a separate body with an organisation of its own have seemed to cut them off from the rest of their fellow-countrymen? But the Church had an existence and led a life of its own from the first. The Christians met together as Christians; they had their own worship, institutions, and mode of life. They formed a community by themselves. The Apostles were the nucleus of the organisation, for their relation to Jesus invested them with an authority which made them the rulers of the new community. No fact is plainer than that the Christians lived a separate and independent existence, with an organisation of their own from the first, and hence the conditions for the institution of an office such as the eldership were always present.

The origin of the eldership is not to be sought in the departure from Jerusalem of the Apostles in order to enter on their missionary labours. This withdrawal on their part would certainly furnish an explanation of the establishment of the office, but of such an abandonment of the metropolis by the Apostles as a body there is no proof. The statement found in the apocryphal *Preaching of Peter* (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5), that our Lord commanded the Apostles to quit Jerusalem after twelve years, is no more credible than the other traditions regarding the movements of the

Apostles (cf. Hort, *Eccl.* 89; Harnack, *Chron.* 243, accepts it). Besides, it is contradicted by the statement of the Acts. Our Lord was put to death most probably in 29 or 30, and twelve years thereafter brings us to 41 or 42. But two at least of the Apostles, and for aught known to the contrary all the Apostles, were in Jerusalem in the year 44. The rest of the Apostles may have fled from the city when James the son of Zebedee was beheaded and Peter put in prison, but there is nothing to show that their withdrawal and that of Peter was other than temporary. A few years later, Peter and John, and probably the rest of the Apostles, were in Jerusalem at the Congress; and it would seem as if Jerusalem was then their ordinary place of residence. Further, is it conceivable that an event of such cardinal importance in the history of Gentile Christianity, as the departure of the Apostles to enter on missionary labours throughout the world, should have been unknown to, or unmentioned by, Luke? Does not the historian plainly imply that the mission on which Paul and Barnabas were despatched by the Church of Antioch was the first systematic attempt to preach to the Gentiles?

The elders occupy a prominent place at the Congress of Jerusalem. They receive the delegates from Antioch, and they are associated with the Apostles in the superscription of the letter. The historian speaks of the Ecclesia and the Apostles and the elders, as if he desired to enumerate the three

bodies composing the Congress. The elders are here evidently a definite group, and their association with the Apostles in the superscription of the letter shows that they were held to be largely concerned in the decision. On the occasion of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem he is formally received by James and the elders. He presents to them the gifts from his different Churches ; and, in order to refute the calumny widely circulated regarding him, they ask him to take a step which he immediately fulfils.

It is plain, then, from these passages that the elders were the authorities, and possibly the sole authorities, of the Church in Jerusalem. And James must evidently be regarded as one of them. The reference to James (Ac 15²²) can hardly be understood, except on the ground that he was a member of their body, and shared with them the responsibility of administering the affairs of the Church.

It is almost universally assumed that the charge of James was strictly local (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 79 ; Lightfoot, *Galatians*). He was president of the Church of Jerusalem only. But there are arguments which almost demonstrate that the sphere he filled was wider. The Church of Jerusalem was the mother Church of all the Jewish Churches. These Churches, it is clear, were united to it, and freely acknowledged its authority. It can hardly be supposed that the different Christian congregations in Judæa ever regarded themselves as independent of one another and of the Church in Jerusalem. Jewish modes of thought and action in

the first century, apart altogether from the hints furnished by the Acts, suggest the conclusion that the leader of the Church of Jerusalem exercised a superintendence over the other Churches within the Holy Land. It may then be taken for granted that the authority of James extended at least over the Holy Land. Nor is there ground for thinking that he resided in Jerusalem so exclusively as never to have visited any of the neighbouring Churches. This course is in itself highly improbable, and is inconsistent with the fact attested by Paul (1 Co 9) that the brethren of the Lord made journeys of visitation. His Epistle, too, is evidence that he considered himself entitled to address the Jewish Churches of the Dispersion, and he may, for anything we know to the contrary, have visited some of their congregations.

On the view often taken that the Apostles were the supreme rulers of the Church, by the will of God, the problem of the relation of the authority of James to that of the Apostles is insoluble; but on the correct view it offers little difficulty. The powers wielded by James and the Twelve were chiefly moral. They made no laws, they performed no acts of administration at their own instance. On all occasions they sought the co-operation of the Church in which they happened to be. Nowhere in the New Testament are any of the authorities of the Church, not even Peter or John or James, described as oracles or judges whose utterances and decisions are final and unchangeable. The New Testament acknowledges no

supreme rule or infallible teaching except the Holy Spirit, and James and the Twelve were, no more than many others in the Church, the organs of the Spirit. Accordingly, collision between James and the Twelve there could be none, for they were in no sense rival powers. And, notwithstanding the offices they filled, apostleship in the stricter or wider sense, their influence was mainly personal. It was the man James or Peter and not the Apostle James or Peter whose views were heard with reverence in the Church.

The suggestion has often been made that James was not merely an Apostle in the wider sense of the term, but that he was actually admitted into the circle of the Twelve. But of this fact there is no evidence, and it is in the highest degree improbable. The language of Peter in describing the qualifications of a successor to Judas specifies conditions which James did not fulfil; and if these conditions remained in force, he could never have been eligible as one of the Twelve. This argument is strengthened by the fact that it is nowhere related that James was enrolled among the Twelve, and it is difficult to believe that so important an incident would have been unrecorded by Luke. Those who maintain that he was tacitly assumed as one of them, or elected into the body, refer the event to a time shortly after the death of James the son of Zebedee. Yet not only is there no notice of his election, but prior to the supposed event he himself appears in the same lofty position that he

continued to hold till the close of his life. Did he then receive no accession of rank or power when called to be an Apostle? Had the primitive Church a purely honorary office?

Nor is this all: James is never termed an Apostle by St. Luke, who confines the term to the Twelve exclusively, save on the two occasions on which he so describes Paul and Barnabas when on their first missionary journey. This exception may be only apparent, for Paul and Barnabas are probably thus denominated as delegates of the Church of Antioch, and not as Apostles of Jesus Christ. Had James been of the Twelve, Luke would surely have been careful to remove from the Acts the impression which it leaves on the reader that he was not included in the group. The assertion that James must have been one of the Twelve, because of his position and authority, belongs to a type of argument which is happily becoming extinct, and which does not demand serious examination.

The view has often been expressed that the great place occupied by James in Jerusalem was due to his relationship to Jesus the Messiah. The Jews attached exceeding importance to the ties of blood, and hence conceded a position to him which he could not have acquired by his talents. He was the leader of the Church of Jerusalem not because of his intellectual and moral ascendancy, but because he was a brother of our Lord's. This opinion deserves to be carefully examined not only because of its bearing on the career

of James, but because of the insight which, if true, it affords into the modes of thought current within the Church of Jerusalem.

What now is the evidence which can be produced in its favour? There is first of all the title given to James the brother of the Lord. But the fact that James is styled the Lord's brother is no proof that the authority he wielded in the Church was not the result of his high character and eminent capacity. If it had been due to his relationship to Jesus, why was it not shared by his brothers? Why did none of it pass to Jude? The argument which is held to prove that it belonged to James must be held to disprove that it belonged to Jude and the rest of the brothers, for it is hard to see why they should not have participated in it; and yet no trace of their having done so appears. To refute this argument it would be necessary to show that the principle of primogeniture was in force within the Church, and that the distinction in question passed only to the oldest male relative. But this opinion is inconsistent with the position assigned to the grandchildren of Jude within the Church, and, indeed, with most that is said regarding our Lord's relatives. Besides, is it likely that legitimist principles of this kind would have been acknowledged in a democratic and self-governing community like the primitive Church in Jerusalem? Were such principles likely to be accepted there? Why then were they not acted on from the first? Why were Paul and Luke alike silent regarding so striking a

fact? Again, it is argued that the fact that James was succeeded in the bishopric by his cousin Symeon (Eusebius, *HE*, iii. 11, iv. 22) confirms the opinion that the position of James within the Church must have been due to his relationship to our Lord. It is hard to see the cogency of this argument. Why should the circumstance that James was followed by his cousin Symeon be taken as proof that they were both chosen on account of their relationship to our Lord? In the absence of any statement that they were thus chosen, why should it be concluded that this was the ground of their selection? It may be granted at once that their kinship to our Lord may have been an advantage and a recommendation. But this is a self-evident fact, for there are few societies in which a relationship to an eminent leader has no tendency to establish a certain claim to influence. The principle is active in the world to-day, and there is no reason for denying that the relations of our Lord were looked upon with honour in the Church, and that their qualifications for office were scanned with no unfriendly eye. But this is merely to say that, other things being equal, they would have a certain preference over others, and is widely remote from the assertion that in view of their kinship they enjoyed a rank which would not otherwise have fallen to them. There is no evidence which proves that James or any of our Lord's relatives owed their position in the Church to other than their own merits. There is no reason to question the fact that James was

succeeded by Symeon his cousin, although the description of the election as having been made by the surviving Apostles and disciples of our Lord, along with the majority of our Lord's relatives, throws suspicion on the details of the narrative; for no one can believe either that the surviving Apostles returned to Jerusalem to take part in the election of a successor to James, or that our Lord's relatives as a body were convened in the same way as the Apostles. Again, if the ground on which Symeon was chosen was that of his relationship to our Lord, why was *he* selected? Was Jude dead? Did James leave no sons? Had none of his sisters sons? The relations of our Lord were apparently numerous. Jude, it is known; had grandchildren. Was it necessary, then, to seek a successor to James in a son of his father's brother? Is such an appointment an illustration of the hereditary principle?

Moreover, the very language in which the appointment of Symeon is related does not contain the assertion that Symeon was chosen because of his kinship to our Lord. The language of Hegesippus may, indeed, bear this construction; but this is not its most obvious meaning, and may be pronounced with confidence not to be its true meaning, for he could not possibly have described Thebuthis as a candidate for the bishopric of Jerusalem along with Symeon, and at the same time have asserted that the succession in the bishopric was confined to the nearest male relatives of our Lord.

Again, it has been urged that the fact that the two grandsons of Jude, after being examined and released by Domitian, became rulers of the Churches (Eusebius, *HE*, iii. 20, 32) is additional proof of the existence of the hereditary principle within the Church of Jerusalem. An examination of the statement of Hegesippus and of its interpretation by Eusebius shows that the basis of the leadership in every Church ascribed to the two grandsons was that they were witnesses, namely, men who had testified their fidelity to Christ before a hostile tribunal, and, further, relations of the Lord. Without discussing here the extent of the authority over the Church attributed to them, it is noteworthy that that authority dated only from the time of their trial, and that it was due only in a subordinate degree to their kinship to our Lord. Besides, it should be pointed out that they are nowhere described as bishops of Jerusalem, yet this is the office which on the hypothesis under examination they should almost certainly have filled.

Finally, it has been inferred from what is related regarding the *Desposynoi* by Julius Africanus (Eusebius, *HE*, i. 7, ii. 14) that relationship to our Lord continued to be a potent factor within the Church, and that its rulers were chosen from among our Lord's relatives. Africanus does not even assert that our Lord's relatives exercised authority within the Church. Only a mind which disdains to move in the limits of historical fact can regard our Lord's relatives as forming an aristocracy in the Jewish Church which would

have issued in the destruction of Christianity, had it not been for the number and weight of the Churches founded by Paul (Renan, *The Gospels*).

No statement is made regarding James more authoritatively than that he was held in the highest esteem alike by Christians and by the Jewish community at large. He was known far and wide by his title of the Just,—a title which set forth the zeal and assiduity with which he fulfilled every obligation of the law.

Is this assertion trustworthy? Is it reasonable to hold that the leader of the Nazarenes was highly esteemed by his unbelieving fellow-countrymen? Is this fact credible in the light of the statements of Acts? How can it be reconciled with the hostility of the Sanhedrin, the persecution in which Stephen perished, and the persecution by Herod Agrippa? It is difficult to believe that the Christian sect could ever have been popular in Jerusalem except during the first years of Christianity; and if the sect itself were unpopular, it is still more difficult to conceive under what circumstances its most eminent representative, who would naturally be regarded as embodying its spirit, should have become popular.

It may be argued, however, in reply, that the strict observance of the law attributed to James fully accounts for the admiration cherished for his character. That devotion compensated in the eyes of his fellow-countrymen for his adherence to the new sect. But is it not equally possible that his acceptance of the

Messiahship of Jesus and his obvious want of sympathy with the political ideals and aspirations of the time rendered him the object of contempt if not of aversion?

Further, there occurs the question: Is it certain that James could have been the type and model of conformity to the Jewish Law which he has generally been described as being? Did he possess the knowledge which enabled him to fulfil the prescriptions of Hillel and Shammai, of Gamaliel I. and of Hananiah ben Hezekiah? Was he so conversant with the Law and its interpretation within the schools as to be able to acquire among the educated classes a repute for zeal and sanctity? But especially, is it in the least degree probable that he would be distinguished for fidelity to the Law in such a manner as to command the approbation at once of his fellow-Christians and of his Jewish fellow-citizens? Would a Christian have been held in special honour among his fellow-Christians for his strict and literal conformity to the precepts of Moses? Any Christian, and especially the most conspicuous and devoted of the Christians, might conceivably have had some epithet bestowed upon him for distinctively Christian qualities or achievements. But it is difficult to realize clearly the situation in which the Christian Church should have bestowed a title of honour for the performance of acts that did not properly concern Christianity. Equally difficult is it to conceive the circumstances under which a life of faithful obedience to the requirements of the

Law, such a life as must have been lived by every Christian in Jerusalem, should have won the attention and obtained the admiration of the Jewish populace of the capital. Or was the life of James exceptional among Christians? Was it exceptional among Jews? Only on these suppositions is the designation bestowed upon him intelligible, and neither of these suppositions can for a moment be entertained.

What now is the evidence that James was thus highly esteemed and known to all as the Just? If the passage quoted from Josephus by Origen (c. *Celsum*, i. 47) and repeated by Eusebius (*HE*, ii. 23) were genuine, the question would be settled. For in it James is expressly characterized as the Just. But the paragraph is condemned by all scholars as an interpolation.

Hegesippus, however (Eusebius, *HE*, ii. 23), affirms that James was termed the Just from the time of Christ onwards to his own day. The veracity of Hegesippus cannot be impeached, but this statement does not rest on his personal knowledge. It is not clear whether he is merely repeating what he found in one of his sources or stating what he had himself ascertained. He may have learned from his own reading that James had become known as the Just. On the other hand, it is possible that he found this statement in the *Ascents of James* or in some similar apocryphal work; at any rate, the assertion is in itself a reasonable inference from the language used to and regarding James in the *Ascents*. He could

also have derived it from the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, where James is thus characterized. Or if the text of Josephus read by Origen were already in circulation, he might have derived his information from it.

The evidence, then, for the bestowal upon James of the title Just is narrowed to the testimony of Hegesippus, if it be independent of that of the *Gospel of the Hebrews*. But the nature of the testimony is hardly such as to justify us in believing that James received this title, alike within and without the Church, because of his strict fulfilment of the Levitical Law. If the name were given him at all within Christian circles, it would be much more reasonable to assign to it a Christian interpretation, and to hold that it was given him for the purity and nobility of his Christian character. Such a fact could easily be distorted by an apocryphal writer. At any rate, the difficulty of believing that such a surname as Just was conferred on James either by Jewish Christians or by Jews in token of his strict performance of the requirements enjoined by the Mosaic Law, is insurmountable. What kind or mode of life could a Christian follow which would procure for him renown and admiration among the Jews? Did James keep the Sabbath according to the precepts of the elders, notwithstanding our Lord's teaching on the subject? Did he assert that circumcision was the first of ordinances, though he believed that man could be saved without it? Was he a champion of Levitical purity and an example of Levitical scrupulosity in

spite of our Lord's teaching and example? Did he proclaim the necessity of observing the different feasts, of avoiding blood and mixed marriages, while he knew that obedience to the moral will of God was the essence of religion? (cf. Book of Jubilees, *passim*). Why, if he acted in this way, is there not a single reference to the requirements of the Law, as thus understood, in his letter? The conclusion cannot be resisted that no Christian could possibly so live as to be held in the highest honour by the Jews. The gulf between them was such as to render this impossible. Much more reasonable, therefore, is it to set aside testimony which is admittedly not contemporaneous; which probably comes from an apocryphal source; which is wholly at variance alike with the spirit and even with the letter of Christianity; which is alien to the teaching of James himself; and which contradicts all that we know of the relations between the Jews and the Christians during the later years of James, and especially the fact of his martyrdom.¹

¹ Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 348, accepts the usual interpretation of the title Just, and is even disposed to think that the narrative of Hegesippus may be substantially true in asserting that his rigid life and strict integrity won for him the respect of the whole Jewish people.

APPENDIX.

EXCURSUS I.

THE READERS OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

IT would seem as if the question who were the readers of the Epistle was easily answered, for its superscription runs thus: 'To the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion.' This phrase in its ethnographical sense designates the Jewish race beyond the borders of Palestine. As the letter is apparently written by a Christian to Christians, the conclusion would seem to follow that the readers of the Epistle were those Jews living beyond the Holy Land who had become converts to Christianity. This is, on the whole, the view most widely held; yet it has frequently been rejected, and it is even strongly challenged to-day. The variety of opinion still manifesting itself regarding the destination of the letter is exceedingly great. It is held that it is addressed to Jews by birth and by religion; to Jews by birth but Christians by religion; to unbelieving and Christian Jews indiscriminately; to Christian Jews exclusively; to Christian Jews, in-

cluding Gentile Christians; to Gentile Christians exclusively.

In this strange medley of opinions the only course to be followed is to study the letter itself in order to determine who the readers were. The first question to be settled is, Were the readers Jews by birth? This is the impression created by the address. Is it confirmed by the contents of the letter? The more thoroughly these are sifted the more cogent becomes the argument in favour of the Jewish nationality of the readers. Each argument taken by itself may not be conclusive, but viewed as a whole they are irresistible. First of all, many expressions in the letter receive in this way their simplest and most natural explanation. This is evidently the case with the address, 'To the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion.' The phrases 'the Twelve Tribes' and the 'Dispersion' are both Jewish in character, and, used in the superscription of a letter, are most readily understood in their literal sense. The use of the expression 'Synagogue' (2^a) to denote either the building in which the Christians assembled for worship or the assembly itself, points in the same direction. And this the more, as the author both knows and employs the word 'Church' (5¹⁴), and could therefore have readily availed himself of it to denote the congregations of Christian Jews or the buildings in which they met. The employment of 'Synagogue' in preference to 'Church' is most easily accounted for by the fact that writer and readers were both Jews.

The remarkable term 'adulteresses' (4^a) applied by the writer to his readers would be understood at once by Jews, who would recall the language of prophecy, according to which the soul was espoused to God, and apostasy from Him was adultery. To a Gentile, on the other hand, such language would be inexplicable. The same conclusion is corroborated by the phrase 'Lord of Sabaoth' (5^a). This expression is not translated, and was therefore presumably understood by the readers. Is it conceivable that Gentiles would comprehend the force of such an expression? A Gentile conversant with the O.T. might know its significance, but such knowledge cannot be presupposed in the case of most Gentile readers. The title given to Abraham 'our father' (2²¹) has often been quoted as decisive evidence for the Jewish origin of the readers. It is possible that this statement, made as it is without explanation, does favour the view that the readers were Jews. But too much force must not be attached to this fact, for Paul in writing to the Church of Rome, in which Gentiles probably formed the majority, speaks of Abraham as "our forefather according to the flesh" (Ro 4¹²); and in writing to the undoubtedly Gentile Church of Corinth, describes the Israelites who quitted Egypt as ancestors of the Corinthian Church ("our fathers were all under the cloud," 1 Co 10¹).

To these arguments, drawn from expressions in the Epistle, another has been added based on allusions to the O.T. It is pointed out that the writer refers to

Abraham, Rahab, Job, Elijah, and the prophets, and it is argued that such instances imply that the readers were Jews. But this contention is altogether inconclusive. The O.T. was the common possession of all Christians, Gentiles as well as Jews. And hence no inference as to the nationality of the readers can be drawn from O.T. references save under special circumstances.

There remain other considerations still more decisive in favour of the view that the readers were Jews. The contents of the letter, alike negative and positive, attest that such was its destination. There is not a single allusion in the letter to the existence of Gentiles; not a line, not a word suggests that they were known to the writer or to his readers. Can this silence be explained if the readers were Gentiles? Is it possible to hold that James, had he addressed Gentile as well as Jewish readers, would not have referred to the sins to which Gentiles were most prone? His purpose throughout is practical. He specifies many sins. Why then does he pass over the idolatry and the unchastity which were the cardinal sins of Gentiles, and against which Paul, for example, continually seeks to guard his readers? Again, the writer dwells with great detail on the social state and relations of his readers. Had these been Gentiles, could he have failed to refer to the existence of slavery? While, then, the letter wholly ignores the existence of the Gentiles, every chapter and almost every verse, on the other hand, can be explained in

the light of Jewish convictions, usages, circumstances, vices, and sins. The unfruitful faith of which monotheism is the cardinal article (2¹⁴ 26) is Jewish. The evident authority which the Law possesses for the readers (2^{8a} 4^{11a}) can hardly be understood of other than Jews. The sins spoken of—avarice, undue pursuit of wealth, swearing, religion divorced from morality—are characteristically Jewish. The oaths mentioned (5¹²) are specifically Jewish. The oppression of the poor by the rich (2⁶) and the various references to the social state of the readers can be readily explained from the relations existing between the Jews and Christians within the synagogue, but hardly in any other way.

As certain as the result just reached, is the result that the readers were Christians. The writer is himself a Christian, and describes himself as such, and takes for granted throughout the whole letter that those to whom he speaks share his beliefs. He calls himself 'a servant of Jesus Christ,' and describes his readers as his brethren (1¹ 1²). The inference that the readers were Christians, suggested by these facts, is confirmed by some of the incidental expressions that fall from his pen. He exhorts his readers not to hold faith in Christ the Lord of glory with respect of persons (2¹). They have been begotten by the word of truth (1¹⁸). The law by which they are governed is a law of liberty (1²⁵ 2¹²). The name which has been pronounced upon them (2⁷) is evidently that of Jesus, a plain allusion to Christian baptism.

The Second Advent is regarded as near (5⁷). But to prosecute this argument further is superfluous. Nothing can be plainer than that the letter is written by a Christian to Christians, or, according to the conclusions we have now reached, by a Christian Jew to Christian Jews.

But this conclusion is not absolutely incompatible with the view that unbelieving Jews, that is, those who rejected as well as those who accepted the claims of Jesus may be included in the address. According to some scholars, one main object of the writer was to reach the unbelieving Jews through the believing, and the teaching of the letter is accordingly intended at least as much for the adherents of Moses as for the adherents of Jesus.

But the letter shows no trace of this distinction of its readers into two classes. It is impossible to separate what is meant for Christians from what is meant for Jews. The assumption of the writer throughout is that what he says to one applies to all. His readers are to him a homogeneous and not a divided body. There is no trace that he regarded any of them as holding convictions other than his own. Further, is it conceivable that a Christian in the position of James would attempt to address in the same letter his believing and unbelieving fellow-countrymen? Was such a project likely to be entertained by him? Would he not much rather have written separate letters? He must have known that it was impossible for him to speak to his fellow-

Christians and to his fellow-Jews in the same terms, that what would please the one would offend the other, that neutrality between them was impossible. What purpose would be served by his addressing Jews in general? Of what advantage in doing so was it to call himself "a bond slave of the Lord Jesus Christ"? (1¹). How could he speak of all Jews as possessing the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ? (2¹). How could he describe them as having been begotten again by the word of God? (1¹⁸). How could he bid them wait patiently for the Second Advent? (5⁷). Above all, how could he speak of all Jews as oppressed by the rich and dragged before tribunals, and as having the honourable name which had been named upon them blasphemed? (2⁶ 7). To suppose then, as has frequently been done, that James had in view Jews as well as Christians, and that, while writing to Christians, he is thinking largely or mainly of Jews, is to misread the contents of the letter. To hold that in one and the same letter he sought to make Christians better Christians and Jews better Jews, is to ascribe to him a purpose self-contradictory from a Christian point of view,—a purpose which no sensible man would have attempted to execute, and a purpose opposed to the contents of the letter. The alleged absence from the letter of specific Christian doctrines is not to be explained by the assumption that the letter was intended for unbelieving as well as for believing Jews. Whatever degree of truth this assertion may contain, the explanation must be sought in

the temperament and views of the writer, and in the circumstances of the readers, but not in their divided sentiments touching Jesus. For of such division there is absolutely no trace whatever.

The view, then, that any Jews other than Christian were included among the readers of the letter must be set aside. Now, may any of the readers have been Gentiles, whether heathen or proselytes? The case of proselytes strictly so called need not be discussed, as these were universally acknowledged as Jews. The instance of Rahab (2nd) has been regarded as adequate proof of the presence of some men of Gentile birth among the readers, who were not in the full sense of the term proselytes. Her name serves the same end in the case of the Gentile members of the communities as Abraham's did in the case of Jewish. But no hint is given by James that such was his intention in adducing the case of Rahab. The explanation just given for a reference to her is far-fetched. If any explanation is needed, and none seems needed, why should the most obvious be rejected, namely, that the writer follows up an instance of the justification of a man by that of a woman? It is possible that here and there Gentiles had been admitted within the Christian communities, but of such admission there is not the slightest indication, direct or indirect, in the letter. While, then, the presence of such Gentiles cannot be denied, it certainly cannot be inferred from the contents of the Epistle.

It is now possible to return to the address in order

to determine its import. The readers, as we have seen, are Jews, a fact with which their description as the Twelve Tribes is in full harmony. But what is the force of the entire address, 'To the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion?' The expression 'the Twelve Tribes,' as applied to Christians, must denote Christian Jews as a whole. But what is to be said regarding the further words 'in the Dispersion'? This title, literally understood, designates the Jews in all quarters outside of Palestine. Driven forth from their land, now by violence, now by the pressure of circumstances, and now by the spirit of commerce, the Jews were by this time scattered over the world, having settlements in its most important countries. They were found in large numbers in Mesopotamia, in Syria, in Asia Minor, in Egypt, and in Rome. Was the writer thinking of his Christian fellow-countrymen and of the communities they had formed in one or perhaps several of these quarters? This is the apparent sense of his language; must it be rejected?

Yes, is the reply, because the phrase 'the Twelve Tribes' denotes the Jewish nation in its entirety. But the letter is addressed to Christians, and hence the words 'in the Dispersion' must indicate the fact that the readers were Christians. The Jewish nation as a whole was not and could not be in the Dispersion. Palestine was always the land of Israel. A Christian Jew, then, in addressing the whole of his Christian fellow-countrymen must have described his readers as Christians, and this description is

found in the words 'in the Dispersion.' The author contrasts the Twelve Tribes whose land is Palestine, whose metropolis is Jerusalem, and whose central sanctuary is the Temple, with the Twelve Tribes who have no earthly land, no earthly metropolis, and no earthly temple (Zahn, *Einl.* i. 56). But this construction of the address is inadmissible. The assertion that the phrase 'the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion' is a contradiction in terms cannot be substantiated. There is nothing intrinsically absurd in the view that Israel beyond the Holy Land should be thus described. No evidence can be adduced to show that this expression had only one fixed sense, and that under all circumstances it designated and could only designate the entire Jewish race. There is no reason to suppose that this language could not be applied to the whole Jewish race within the Holy Land or to the whole race outside of that land. An Englishman can properly speak of all the British outside of the United Kingdom, and with equal propriety a Jew could speak of the Jews outside of Palestine. The expression 'the Twelve Tribes' denoted Jews viewed as a whole, but did not necessarily include every Jew. Further, how can it be supposed that the words 'in the Dispersion' form a description of Christianity? The term 'Dispersion' bears a distinctively geographical sense. It was the technical term for Israel outside of Palestine. This is its only legitimate sense here, for neither on grammatical nor on ethnographical grounds is it possible to regard the two descriptions, 'the

Twelve Tribes' and 'the Dispersion,' as standing in apposition to one another.

But why did the author choose such a mode of address to designate his Jewish fellow-Christians? Why does he omit from the address specifically Christian terms? How could he possibly speak of his fellow-Christians in the Dispersion as 'the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion'? There can be but one answer to this question. It was because he held that Christianity was the true Judaism that he described his Jewish fellow-Christians as the only true Jews. In his judgment the Christian Church had taken the place of the Jewish, though as yet the only Christian Church known to him was apparently the Church of believing Jews. When speaking of the Twelve Tribes, he is using language which is to him literal rather than figurative. He is not thinking of expressions such as 'the Israel of God' (Gal 6¹⁶), or 'Israel after the flesh' (1 Co 10¹⁸), or of those who are 'strangers and pilgrims on earth' (He 11¹³), but of his Jewish fellow-Christians who are to him the only true Israelites. The Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion are to him political or ethnographical designations, and not theocratic or religious. For there is nothing to suggest that he uses this language in any metaphorical sense. Had he so used it, would not the superscription have been a hopeless riddle to the great body of its readers?

EXCURSUS II.

THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

IF the Epistle is genuine, it must have been composed before the year 62, in which James was put to death. The persecution in which Stephen fell was the principal means of scattering the Jewish Christians over the adjacent lands, and was the chief cause of the establishment of Jewish Christian congregations. The date of the persecution cannot be determined with precision, but it was probably between 35 and 37. Allowing two or three years for the origin and growth of Jewish Christian congregations, twenty years lie open during which the Epistle may have been written. By a very few scholars the opinion is held that it may have been prepared almost at any time during these years. On the other hand, nearly all writers contend for one or other of two dates. At the present moment most scholars favour a date preceding the Apostolic Congress, which was probably held about 51. A year or two before the death of James is preferred by a small number of scholars, including, however, some highly distinguished for sagacious and solid judgment. What, now, are the arguments upon which those who

accept the earlier date rely? It is pointed out that the Epistle contains no reference to the presence of Gentiles within the Church, and is addressed to Jewish Christians in the Dispersion. From the Book of Acts it is plain that after Paul's first missionary journey, say 49 and 50, there were Christian congregations consisting partly of Jews and partly of Gentiles. A letter, then, sent to the Jewish Christians in the Dispersion could hardly fail to take notice of such mixed congregations. But more than this. There broke out, in consequence of the successful labours of Paul, a controversy, concerning the relation of Gentile Christians to the Law of Moses, which threatened to rend the Church in twain. A number of Christian Jews contended that the Gentiles could not be saved unless they submitted to the rite of circumcision. This question was decided at a Conference held in Jerusalem in 51. The decision of the Conference governed the relations between Jewish and Gentile Christians in mixed communities. But the Epistle contains no reference either to the controversy or to the resolutions passed by the Conference. A letter written subsequent to the Congress could hardly have failed to notice the question of the relation between the two sections of the Church, for the subject was continually being agitated, and Paul found it necessary to refer to it repeatedly in his teaching and letters. Again, it is undeniable that, so far as our information extends, Gentile Christians soon became the most numerous in the

congregations of the Dispersion. This appears to have been the case in Antioch at a very early date, and was undoubtedly the case in all the Churches founded by Paul. The existence of purely Jewish Churches in certain quarters of the East and West can neither be affirmed nor denied. There may have been congregations consisting exclusively of Jews in some portions of Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Cyrene, and Rome. On the other hand, it is not less probable that whatever Christian congregations existed in these quarters were composed partly of Jews and partly of Gentiles. But, however this may have been, no writer addressing the entire body of Jewish Christians, say in 54, could have overlooked the many mixed congregations that had sprung up through the labours of Paul.

These weighty arguments have been supplemented by others which, though frequently employed, are less convincing. The immaturity of the teaching of the letter, its affinity to Judaism, its strongly Jewish temper, have been represented as clear indications of an early date. But, even though this description of the letter were true, the inference as to the time of its composition is unfounded. The characteristics mentioned could just as readily have been found in a writer of the year 60 as of the year 50. Again, the simple and indeterminate character of the organization of the Churches, as depicted in the Epistle, has been dwelt on in the same connection. But the absence of any reference to bishops and deacons, the

mention of elders only, the permission to teach apparently given to all, and the use of the term 'synagogue,' are of no avail in determining whether the letter was written before or after the Congress at Jerusalem.

What, now, are the arguments by which this evidence for a date prior to the Congress is rejected? It is alleged that the Epistle of James can hardly be the earliest letter of the N.T., because the practice of writing such Epistles probably began only with Paul (Sanday, *Inspiration*, 345). The majority of Christian writers have generally taken for granted that the writing of doctrinal epistles was to the first generation of Christians a matter of course. But this view is arraigned, and it is argued that little or nothing can be said for it, and that the practice must have originated with Paul the missionary as he passed from city to city. He had occasion to govern the communities he founded by his letters. And the example he set would be rapidly followed. But this opinion is purely hypothetical. It cannot be proved that Paul was the first to write letters to Christian congregations. The same causes that led him to write could lead others to write also. The practice was not so novel and original that it could not have begun with James rather than with Paul.

The most decisive argument on which reliance is put to prove the later date of the Epistle is the alleged reference to the teaching of Paul on justification (c. 2), due to a knowledge of the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans. But it cannot be

shown that the Epistle presupposes that James had read either of these Epistles. This supposition has been abandoned by the most thoughtful defenders of the later date, because they recognise how incredible it is that James, had he known these letters, could have written in the terms he has done. But, if James were not acquainted with these letters, is it probable that he knew them at second hand, or that he had heard of perverted views current in Jewish Christian circles based upon these? This is in the highest degree improbable. Had he, then, become acquainted in some other way with a distorted version of Paul's teaching? And is it to this he refers? Granting that this is so, the case for the later date is not established unless it can be shown that the teaching of Paul as to justification only took final shape considerably after 51. But this is not only incredible in itself, but is shown to be erroneous by the circumstance that the Epistle to the Galatians may possibly be the earliest of Paul's letters, and that it clearly indicates that he had taught justification when he first laboured among the Galatians. On the supposition that the Epistle to the Galatians is the first of Paul's letters, he must have taught justification by faith in Galatia on his first missionary journey, which took place a year or two before the Congress. There is every reason for holding that Paul from the outset of his career as a teacher proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith. And if this were so, a perverted view of his teaching at Antioch could

easily have reached James in ample time to allow his referring to it in his letter. For the teaching of Paul in Antioch preceded by several years the probable date of the Epistle of James.

The view, then, that the Epistle of James must be referred to a date shortly before the death of the author, because of its reference to the doctrine of justification, can only be maintained on the ground that either James himself or his informants had read the letters to the Galatians and the Romans, or, at any rate, the latter, and that his language is directed either against the teaching of Paul or against that teaching misunderstood or perverted. The question whether he did so is discussed elsewhere, with the result that there is no likelihood that James is referring either directly or indirectly to Paul's teaching regarding justification.

Again, it is argued that the condition and wide dissemination of the Churches referred to in the letter tell in favour of the later date. The Churches are in a settled condition, and must, therefore, have been formed for some time. But our knowledge of the condition of the Churches is of the scantiest kind, and we are quite ignorant as to the extent of their dissemination. Ten years amply suffice to account for the state of the Churches as described in the Epistle. Nor is there anything to show that the readers had for years been taught Christian doctrines, and that their possession of such knowledge is taken for granted, and that, consequently, the Churches must

have existed for a long time. No conclusion can be drawn from what is said concerning respect of persons. This may have shown itself very early. In fact, the briefest interval of time is adequate to account for such a practice. Again, it is erroneous to speak of the letter as proving that the delay of the Second Coming was felt, and that, consequently, the Epistle cannot have been written at an early date. On the contrary, the belief in the Second Advent is strong, and that event is immediately expected. Besides, though complaint had been uttered as to the delay of the Advent, this would have been no proof of a later date, because the standard by which such delay is to be measured is a purely subjective one. Equally inconclusive is the inference drawn from the political conditions shadowed forth in the Epistle. It is impossible to connect these conditions exclusively with the years immediately preceding the death of James. Anything said in the Epistle regarding them is just as applicable to the year 50 as to the year 60.

EXCURSUS III.

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE EPISTLE.

IS the Epistle, as it lies before us, an original or a translation? There is certainly nothing in the language to suggest that the letter was not composed in Greek, as it reads from beginning to end like an original work. No turn of phrase can be indicated which would even favour the opinion that it is a translation. How then has it come to pass that several scholars have inclined to the view that it was written not in Greek but in Aramaic? In arriving at this conclusion they have been influenced mainly by two considerations: first, by the probability that James would write Jewish Christians in Aramaic rather than in Greek; and, secondly, by the remarkable character of the diction and vocabulary of the letter. It is argued that there is likelihood that James composed or dictated the letter in Aramaic. This was his own vernacular tongue, and it was widely spoken and read. It was used by our Lord; it was employed by Paul when he addressed the populace in Jerusalem from the stairs. The Gospel of St. Matthew, according to an early tradition, was composed in it. Mark and Glaucias are early

described as interpreters of Peter, that is, probably as those who translated his Aramaic into Greek; and Josephus wrote his *Wars of the Jews* in Aramaic, and afterwards translated it into Greek with some help. On these grounds James, it is argued, would almost certainly write to his Christian fellow-countrymen in Aramaic.

But these considerations are of little value. It is true that James doubtless spoke the vernacular of Palestine as our Lord and Paul did. But as our Lord could speak Greek, why should not James have done so too? Whether Matthew wrote a gospel in Aramaic or not may be left undecided, but as a tax-gatherer he must almost certainly have spoken and written Greek as well as Aramaic; and the Gospel bearing his name presents no evidence of being a translation. To suppose that Peter needed an interpreter because of his imperfect acquaintance with Greek is absurd, as the proofs of his knowledge of that language superabound. Those scholars who hold that the language referred to is Latin and not Greek can make out a better case, but the interpretation spoken of is probably not that of translation but of communication, Mark and Glaucias being the organs or vehicles of the memories and views of Peter. The action of Josephus merely illustrates what was done by a writer who composed with the Eastern Dispersion in his eye. At the highest these instances but serve to show that the Epistle might have been written in the vernacular, but create no presumption

that it was so written. Against it must be set the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews is written in Greek. This, too, is the case with the Epistle of Jude and with the two Epistles of Peter. The Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed to Jews, and is thus akin to the Epistle of James; and the other Epistles just named, even if addressed to Gentiles, are the product of so-called Jewish Christians. Are all these letters translations? If the scholars who espouse the opinion that the letter is a translation had succeeded in showing that James could not write Greek, or that it is altogether unlikely that he would write in Greek to the audience he addressed, their reasons would be convincing. But no such endeavours can be made with success. The fuller our knowledge of the Holy Land in the first century, the stronger becomes the conviction that men in the position of our Lord's Apostles were able to acquire the power of both speaking and writing Greek. Further, if the Epistle was written before the Conference in Jerusalem to Churches composed largely of Jews and found chiefly in Syria, there is, to say the least, as great a probability that James would write in Greek as in Aramaic, for the Christian Jews in Antioch and elsewhere in Syria were doubtless as familiar with Greek as with Aramaic. Nor is this result affected, even on the assumption that James had in mind also the Christian Jews within the Persian empire. Had he written for them exclusively, he might, as Josephus did afterwards, have

written in Aramaic. But, as he was addressing all Jews outside of Palestine, he naturally availed himself of the literary and commercial language of the world, a language doubtless more or less familiar to most Jews, and which might indeed be described as the vernacular of the Western Dispersion. It is then obvious that the cases adduced do not even establish a slight probability that James would write in Aramaic. They are partly inaccurate and partly irrelevant, while on the other side are considerations of no little weight.

But it is alleged that the Greek of the Epistle is such as James could not readily have written (Wordsworth, *Stud. Bibl.* i. 148). Its vocabulary is Hellenic. It contains no fewer than forty-nine words which occur in it only in the New Testament, of which thirteen are apparently used for the first time by James. The Epistle seems the writing of a scholar who had a wide knowledge of classical Greek. Would an unlearned Jew be able to exhibit such a command of words? How much more probable that the selection is due to a professional translator!

Our knowledge, however, of the Greek which James wrote and spoke is too scanty to allow us to distinguish between it and the language known to us through the classics. There is no reason to believe that James used other than the vocabulary of his age. That he acquired the rare and special words he employs from a laborious study of Greek literature and philosophy is in the highest degree improbable, for such were not likely to be the pursuits of the chief member of the

Church of Jerusalem. The hypothesis that he employed a translator to put his thoughts into Greek is far more probable than the hypothesis that he spent much of his time in mastering the Greek language and literature.

But does the Epistle bear any mark of being a translation? If it is a translation, it is one of unusual excellence. There are no phrases or constructions in it which need to be explained by the original Aramaic. The keenest eye can detect nothing which might not be conceived and expressed by a Jew conversant with Greek. Is there any example of a translation like this in New Testament times? Can any version of an ancient author be produced which equals this? Is there any parallel between it and the versions of the LXX? The language is simple, direct, forcible, and in fullest harmony with the thoughts. Yet the spirit and the forms of the letter are Jewish. It has come from the brain and pen of a Jew, for none but a Jew would have employed such phrases as "the shadow cast by turning" (1¹⁷); "the face of truth" (1²³); "judges of evil thoughts" (2⁴); "adulteresses" (4⁴); "the Lord of Sabaoth" (5⁴). A translator would hardly have allowed such expressions to remain. But the most decisive argument against its being a translation is to be found in the play on words, the repetitions, the illustrations, of which it is full. Who can suppose, for example, that the use of *χαίρειν* (1¹) and the evident allusion to it in 1² (*χάραν*) are due to a translator? Further, if James wrote in Aramaic, why

should the original have left not a trace behind? Why should not the Syriac translation have been made from it and not from the Greek version? (For Hebraisms in James, see Simcox, *Language of the New Testament*, 62.)

EXCURSUS IV.

THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL RELATIONS OF JAMES AND PAUL.

THOSE who maintain the view that the Epistle of James is perhaps the earliest of the N.T. writings, are at once confronted with the question whether Paul had read the Epistle of James, and whether in his writings he takes notice of the teaching of that Epistle. These two questions are related, but should be kept distinct. It is possible that Paul was familiar with the Epistle of James and yet made no use of it. It is equally possible that he was unacquainted with it, but was familiar with the type of teaching which it represents, and that he has this type of teaching in his mind when addressing the Galatians and the Romans.

Is it then the case that Paul had read the Epistle of James? This question is answered in the affirmative by many of those scholars who believe that the Epistle of James is the first of the N.T. letters. Holding that the Epistle was written about the year 50, and the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans several years after, they argue that nothing is easier than to believe that Paul had obtained a copy of the

letter of James and was therefore familiar with its contents. They assert that it is altogether improbable that he should have remained ignorant of so important an event as the publication of a letter by James, perhaps the first of all similar writings, and that he would naturally desire to possess a copy. That it was quite possible for Paul to become acquainted with the Epistle of James, can hardly be doubted. But the question is not whether Paul could have known the Epistle of James but whether that knowledge can be proved. Does an examination of his writings, and more particularly of the Epistle to the Romans, make it probable that the coincidences between the Epistles are due to his recollection of the letter of James.

Very full lists of resemblances between the writings of Paul and the Epistle of James have been drawn up by several scholars within the last few years. Of these perhaps the most exhaustive is that contained in the Commentary of Mayor. It is not necessary, however, to go over this or any similar list in order to determine whether there is literary dependence on the side of Paul or not. Such a question is easily settled by a consideration of the closest resemblances. There are two passages which by general consent are allowed to be most akin to one another. These are Ja 1²⁻⁴ and Ro 5³⁻⁵, Ja 4¹ and Ro 7²³. Is it then the case that Paul could only have written these passages from a knowledge of the corresponding passages in the Epistle of James? It has been argued that Paul's use of the term 'tribulation' ($\theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\psi\iota\varsigma$) is a

correct interpretation of James' *δοκίμιον* and that consequently Paul had read his letter. But, even though the assertion made were correct, the conclusion would not follow. It would have been easy for Paul to write as he has done without ever having seen the Epistle of James. Besides, the language of Paul is much more general than that of James, and affords no evidence that it was suggested by that of James. The possibility of its being so must, of course, be conceded, but it cannot for a moment be granted that any proof of this fact has been given. The language of Paul may just as easily be independent. For it should be observed that each writer pursues his own line of thought. That of Paul is quite as original and distinctive as that of James. Paul in no sense imitates James. To allege that Paul sets himself to explain how the patience of which James speaks has its perfect work, is to make an assertion unwarranted by the evidence. It is far from certain that he shows how patience has its perfect work. Clearly he follows his own line of thought without any reference to that taken by James. Again, the suggestion has been made that Paul's *δοκιμή* (probation) is an echo of James' *δοκίμιον* (what is genuine).¹ It is barely possible that the one phrase may have suggested the other, but a possibility differs very widely from a proof. So far, then, as this first passage is concerned, the dependence of Paul on James is certainly not made out.

It is the same with the second alleged instance of

¹ Cp. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 260.

dependence. Here the expressions "pleasures that war in your members" and "law in my members warring against the law in my mind" are undoubtedly similar. But the differences are as great as the resemblances. Unquestionable evidence of relationship there is none. The terms used are neither so original nor so rare as to evince that Paul must have derived them from James. But not only are the terms comparatively common. The metaphor is one that could readily occur independently to two writers.

As these two passages have failed to establish a literary connection between the Epistles, it is unnecessary to pursue the argument further. There are not a few more or less distant resemblances between the letters. But this cumulative argument is of no weight unless some actual instances of dependence can be established. This, as we have seen, cannot be done. None, in fact, of the usual proofs of literary dependence are found in the two Epistles. There are no unique or unusual expressions which the one writer must necessarily have taken from the other. Nor are similar arguments used, nor the same order of thought followed, nor any O.T. passage quoted with the same variations from the current text.

It may, then, be taken for granted that it cannot be shown that Paul has made use in any of his Epistles of that of James. This does not, however, imply that he was not acquainted with the letter. He may have read, and even have known it thoroughly, and yet have made no use of it. It is even possible that

it may have suggested some of his phraseology. But this must remain a mere hypothesis and nothing more.

We now pass to the consideration of the question whether Paul writes with conscious reference to the teaching on justification by works contained in the Epistle of James. Here the principal passage is Ro 4¹⁻⁸: "What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not toward God. For what saith the Scripture? And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness." It is alleged (Zahn, *Einl.* i. 90, 94) that Paul when writing these words had the assertion of James in his mind that Abraham was justified by works (2²¹). Paul, it is affirmed, introduces this statement as if made by some other person. This assertion is without warrant. But, even though it were true, it would not follow that the person referred to was James, for the statement as it stands was not made by James. There is not the slightest evidence that Paul is here writing with the teaching of James in view. It is acknowledged that Paul does not controvert the statement of James, but the evidence that he controverts it is just as strong as the evidence that he qualifies it. The evidence that suffices to show that James is here dealing directly or indirectly with the teaching of Paul would also suffice to show that he is assailing that teaching. No reader of the passage in Romans can find there any allusion to the view of

James, much less evidence that the readers of the Epistle were acquainted with the author of the doctrine referred to, and with the high estimation in which he was held. Who can believe that readers in Rome detected any allusion to the teaching of James? Do even independent readers to-day find any such allusion? Had Paul regarded the views of James as defective or erroneous, would he not have said so? Would he not have mentioned his name, and specified what he considered to be imperfect or wrong? Why should he, to all appearance, deliberately contradict the assertion that a man is justified by works? Why should he assert that a man is justified by faith? Surely Paul was too brave and manly not to express his dissent from the views of James, had he really differed from him. If he believed that there was no difference between them, he would hardly have employed language seemingly contradictory without some explanation. A clause or a sentence would have made it plain to every reader that James and he were at one. Could Paul, with his delicate sense of what was fitting and with his passionate devotion to the unity of the Church, have failed to do what a man of ordinary sagacity and prudence would unquestionably have done?

The point of time at which James and Paul formed their conclusions regarding the nature of justification cannot be determined. It is possible that Paul had formulated his view of justification by faith and James his of justification by works when they first met.

It may even have been that the conversation between them turned on this question of doctrine. But this is a mere surmise. Still, there is not the slightest improbability in the hypothesis that Paul may have become acquainted from the lips of James himself with his view that justification was of works. But it is just as possible that he did not know James' opinion on the subject, and that his letters to the Galatians and Romans were written in perfect independence of this knowledge. Further, Paul could have written as he has done, even though he were acquainted with James' letter. He would have no difficulty in recognising that the truth there enforced as to the nullity of faith without works is undeniable. The manner in which that truth is stated by James was different from that in which he would have stated it; but as to the truth itself they were at one. Even on the assumption that Paul was perfectly familiar with the assertion of James that a dead faith did not justify, but that faith had to be perfected by works, it is not in the least certain that he would have found himself under the necessity of challenging such a mode of statement. Aware that James and he were united in their condemnation of a fruitless faith, he could quite well expound his own view without any reference to that of James. Only on the supposition that James held that a man was justified by works, in precisely the same sense in which he himself held that he was justified by faith, would it have been imperative upon him to refer to the teaching of

James. Under such circumstances he would undoubtedly have done so, and in such a way as to make the person from whom he differed and the teaching to which he was opposed unmistakable. The fact that his teaching is not essentially at variance with that of James shows how improbable it is that he had that teaching in view when writing either to the Galatians or to the Romans. What occupied his mind was not justification by works as conceived by James, but justification by works as conceived by his Judaistic opponents, namely, justification resting on the acceptance of the Mosaic Law, including circumcision, as a rule of life, and an obedience thereto as the condition of salvation. Nor can it be shown that it was in the least necessary for Paul in writing to the Churches of Galatia or to the Church of Rome to refer in the slightest to the teaching of James, for that teaching, even on the supposition that it was erroneous, was not the form of error against which these Churches needed then to be put on their guard.

The conclusion just reached is not accepted by some writers. It is alleged (Mayor, 89) that Paul distinctly controverts the arguments of James as liable to be misapplied. The statement of James, "Faith apart from works is barren," is directly contradicted by the assertion, "We reckon that a man is justified by faith apart from works of the law" (Ro 3²⁸). But such a contradiction as this is fatal to the unity of sentiment between James and Paul. It is hardly conceivable that Paul could have

expressed himself thus in more or less direct antagonism to James. Was Paul so lacking in insight as not to perceive the substantial identity of view between James and himself, or was he so wanting in command of language as to be unable to make that identity plain, without as it were directly traversing the assertion of James? To maintain that Paul challenges the phrase of James by a direct contradiction (Mayor, 89), and that yet they agree generally in their conclusions, is to attempt to combine two irreconcilable positions. It is not credible that Paul could have written as he has done, with direct reference to the teaching of James, without introducing some terms of explanation or qualification.

Again, James had asserted that Abraham was justified by works; St. Paul affirms that he cannot have been thus justified, because otherwise he would have had a ground for boasting, but that such a ground is inconsistent with the fact that his faith was reckoned for righteousness. Here, again, to suppose that Paul has James in view is to become involved in endless perplexities. Why should Paul deal with a subject foreign to him? His intention was to prove that obedience to the works of the Law was not the ground of justification. This assertion is nowhere made by James. Why then should Paul have virtually attributed it to him? It is true that both writers deal with the question of the justification of Abraham by works, the one affirming

and the other denying it. But, to use the technical language of philosophy, they are not dealing with the same matter. The line of action (Mayor, 90) attributed to Paul is hardly conceivable in the case of so original and sagacious a thinker, is refuted by the proper explanation of his language, and is, indeed, almost self-contradictory.

If Paul, then, is not directly or indirectly dependent upon James, may not James, on the other hand, exhibit both literary and theological dependence upon Paul? This view has been widely held alike by those who accept and by those who reject the authenticity of the letter.

The attempt has been made (Holtzmann, *Einl.* 335) to demonstrate that the Epistle of James is closely related to the letters of Paul, and that its ideas and language are derived from these. The terminology of Paul is alleged to prevail in the letter, and reference is made in this connection to such phrases as "justification by faith and works," "the righteousness of God," "to fulfil the Law"; to the union of the conceptions 'inheritance' and 'Kingdom,' and so forth. It has, moreover, been confidently affirmed (Holtzmann, *NT Th.* ii. 341) that the force of the proof drawn from the identity of the Biblical illustrations used by Paul and James cannot be invalidated. The example of Abraham was, indeed, often appealed to, and a connection was even established between the text, Gn 15^e, and the sacrifice of Isaac, as is plain from 1 Mac 2⁵²: "Was not Abraham found

faithful in temptation, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness?" The question of Abraham's justification was, in fact, frequently debated in the Jewish schools, but this cannot account for the manner in which James quotes from the O.T. He seeks to prove justification by works from a text which speaks only of justification by faith, and achieves this result by prefixing to it another text, Gn 22⁹, which speaks of the sacrifice of Isaac, and is thus able to force on the original text a meaning foreign to it. That the line of proof followed by James is peculiar strikes every attentive reader, but the conclusion drawn by such a reader is the very opposite of that just stated. What a simpleton James was to proceed as he did! Why did he not simply omit the reference to the faith of Abraham? He was under no compulsion to cite the text. The fact that Paul had made use of it was no reason why he should also make use of it. The mode of argumentation followed by James is the clearest sign of his independence. To argue that he had no choice but to quote the text, seeing that Paul had already quoted it as a proof of righteousness by faith, is absurd. He could easily have passed it by. James regarded the instance of Abraham as an undoubted confirmation of his own view, taking it for granted that his was a case of justification by works. How could he have done so had he been dealing with Paul's view in Ro 4²? But there is no proof that Paul was the first to formulate either the phrase "justifica-

tion by faith" or the phrase "justification by works." Just as little is the expression "the righteousness of God" peculiar to him. The phrase, to begin with, probably comes from our Lord Himself (Mt 6¹), and, what is most important, is not used by James in the sense in which it is used by Paul. The expression "to fulfil the Law" is in no sense characteristic of Paul, and is, in fact, employed only in a special sense in Ro 2⁷. The union of the terms 'inheritance' and 'kingdom' is not Paul's but Christ's (Mt 25³⁴). To discuss the dependence of James on Paul's letters generally, and, more particularly, on Galatians and Romans, is, after the result already arrived at, superfluous. The evidence is such as to allow of no conclusion being formed on purely literary grounds. So far as these are concerned, James might have written before Paul or Paul before James.

But does the manner in which James deals with the doctrine of justification make it certain that Paul's letters must have preceded his? Unless it can be shown that Paul was the first to raise the question of the nature of justification, whether by faith or by works, the priority of Paul cannot be maintained. But if James had even read and possessed the Epistles of Paul, it by no means follows that he would have assailed Paul's teaching. If he had really meant to oppose that teaching, why should he have been silent regarding the source from which it came? The personal courage, the devotion to truth, the sense of authority with which James speaks,

are undoubted. Such a man could scarcely have omitted to name the author of the views which he condemned without laying himself open to misconception. It is hardly credible that James could have really differed from Paul on the question of justification and sought to substitute another view for his, without indicating his dissent in plain words.

Nor is there the slightest reason for believing that the views of Paul and James were actually different, for Paul himself vouches for their substantial identity. No other interpretation can be put upon the account given by Paul himself regarding the negotiations that preceded the decision of the Congress. Paul states that he explained to James the nature of the gospel which he preached, and that James raised no objection to it. It is hardly probable that the doctrine of gratuitous forgiveness through the free grace of God, namely, justification by faith, was absent from the statement; and hence there is the highest probability that Paul and James were of one mind on the point. Further, the views assailed by James are not Paul's, but are utterly opposed to his. All that is most characteristic of his teaching is absent. Even the language in which it is clothed is not purely reproduced. Paul would have repudiated instantly and absolutely the views assailed quite as much as James himself, and would have described them as a caricature of his teaching.

On these grounds it is exceedingly improbable that James deals with Paul's doctrine directly. It is

equally improbable that he deals with it indirectly. It has been urged that he had before him a perversion or distortion of Paul's view, and that he had heard that immoral consequences were drawn from this view; that men believed themselves to be at liberty to live as they pleased; and hence set himself to correct it. But, if James was aware that the opinion he condemned was a perversion or distortion of Paul's view, would he not have been careful to discriminate between his real view and its alleged perversion? Was such a line of action not imperative upon him under the circumstances? In the interests of Christianity, was it not desirable that a misconception of one of the most characteristic articles of the Christian creed should be corrected? And how could this be so well done as by a simple statement of what the article really was? Again, if James had had Paul's letters before him, would he have written as he has actually done? Would he have referred to Abraham's example as an instance of justification by works and not by faith? Would he have contrasted works and faith as he does? It is scarcely credible that with Paul's letters before him he would have treated any perversion or misunderstanding of his teaching in the language which he actually uses. Again, is there the slightest likelihood that Paul's views would be known and perverted in Jewish Christian circles? Was Paul's authority as a teacher acknowledged there? On the contrary, is it not certain that his influence in such circles was

slight? The extent of his authority among his believing fellow-countrymen is, to say the least, disputable. Besides, was justification by faith a tenet likely to be eagerly embraced in such circles? Was it likely to dislodge the tenet of justification by works? Was it more likely that a Christian Jew would depend for justification on his faith in Jesus than on his fidelity to the Law?

EXCURSUS V.

JUSTIFICATION.

THE sense of the term 'justify' in the Epistle hardly admits of doubt. It means, as elsewhere both in the Old and New Testaments, to *pronounce righteous*. It denotes the verdict of a judge. That this is the force of the term is proved by overwhelming evidence. No instance in which it bears the sense *to make just* can be produced either from the Old Testament or from the New, or even from classical literature. James, then, simply used a term which was widely current, and only in its ordinary signification, when he employed 'justify' to denote the verdict of God upon a man's conduct. But, granting that the term is used in a forensic sense, must it necessarily mean, and mean only, a decision of God? May it not be used in the sense *to prove righteous*, or even *to bring into a right moral relation with God*? The latter view is excluded by the proper meaning of the term, for it is impossible to reconcile this interpretation with the current usage of the word in a forensic sense, since *to put into a right moral relation* is to *make* and not to *declare* righteous. There are passages in which the rendering *to prove righteous*

may be employed. But this sense is inadmissible in James, for the text shows that he is thinking throughout of a judgment on the part of God. The connection between salvation (2¹⁴) and justification is evidently close; the one term is practically equivalent to the other. Accordingly the justification spoken of must refer to the decision of God.

The term 'justify' in itself conveys no information as to the moral character of the person concerned. It does not assert that he is righteous of himself, it merely affirms that he is treated as such. The O.T. speaks repeatedly of the justification of the righteous, meaning of those who actually are such. The same usage is found in the N.T. when our Lord in Matthew 12³⁷ speaks of a man as justified by his words.

Even Paul himself—"The doers of the law shall be justified" (Ro 2¹³); "Yet am not I hereby justified" (1 Co 4⁴)—employs the term to denote true righteousness. Whether, then, justification denotes the acquittal of a guilty person or the approbation of a righteous person, can be learned only from the context.

What now are the propositions which James advances touching justification? Negatively, he affirms that a man is not justified by faith only. Positively, he asserts that a man is justified by works. The most exact representation of his view is probably that which sees justification in a combination of faith and works. Faith alone cannot justify, for such a faith is morally unfruitful. But works justify, because

through them faith is perfected. The works which justify are, of course, Christian works. Only the man who lives an obedient life is justified according to James, and he is justified in view of his obedience.

James does not specify the precise stage at which the Christian is justified. Christian faith being to him imperfect until embodied in works, justification cannot be contemporaneous with the origin of faith. Whether James would have allowed that God pronounces a man just in view of his first deed of faith, or whether he held that only when faith had become a habit justification took place, is not clear. It is plain that he regarded faith as the source of Christian obedience. But at what point of time it became such is uncertain. He may have held that the first act of obedience rendered faith vital, but he may not have connected justification with this act. That he regarded justification, however, as falling within the lifetime of the individual, is plain from the instances which he quotes. Abraham and Rahab were pronounced righteous while in life. Accordingly, it is improper to refer the justification of which he writes to the final judgment (Huther, *James*) or even to the end of life. James is obviously speaking of an experience which fell to Abraham and Rahab during their lifetime. This experience cannot be identified with the final divine judgment. To describe justification as "that judgment of complacency which God forms to Himself, about the life of a pious man spent in His sight, on which He will in His own time pass His final decision" (Beyschlag,

NT Theol. 365), is an attempt to combine incompatible views, because making the decision at once past and future. The decision refers to the past only.

But what now is to be said regarding the moral character of the person justified? That character is not described by James. His language, however, suggests that he is speaking of a man truly righteous, and of him only. The man who is justified is a man who has done the will of God, and who is therefore truly righteous. In speaking thus, James is simply stating a self-evident truth, which finds recognition throughout the entire N.T. He is but affirming that, until a man is recognised by God to be truly good, he is not justified. Not those who profess goodness, but those who are good, are accepted by God.

Does this view of James exclude the doctrine that justification is of grace? Is it inconsistent with the opinion that salvation is of grace? It should be observed that James nowhere says that a man must be perfectly righteous. What he contends for is that a man must be truly righteous. His religion must consist not in profession merely, but in obedience. He cannot have meant that only the absolutely perfect man is justified, for he knows that all men err (3²), and that all need to confess their sins one to another (5¹⁶). Forgiveness is needed by all Christians (5¹⁵⁻¹⁶). Consequently James cannot have identified the works which he requires for justification with perfect submission and obedience to the will of God. Grace in the sense of pardon is therefore needed even

in the case of the man who is pronounced righteous because of his works.

Not only so. James nowhere asserts that a man's works alone are the ground on which he is justified. So far as justification consists merely in the declaration of what he is, works may be said to be the basis of the verdict. But nowhere does James say that a man's salvation is due to his obedience, or that his power to obey is self-derived. The judgment of God contemplated by James, according to which a man is pronounced righteous, is not purely analytic; it is rather synthetic, for the righteousness spoken of is the righteousness of sincerity and reality, not of perfection. Consequently there is with James as ample a sphere for grace as with Paul. To James not less than to Paul justification and salvation are of grace. To be justified by works is not inconsistent with being justified by grace. Justification, with James springing from faith perfected by works, presupposes grace just as justification springing from faith with Paul. Justification with Paul may be spoken of as the justification of the unrighteous, and justification with James as the justification of the righteous; but both these expressions require to be carefully defined and explained. The unrighteous man who is justified according to Paul has within him a living principle of righteousness. The righteous man who is justified according to James is simply the same man with that principle matured and confirmed by works.

EXCURSUS VI.

WAS THE QUESTION OF THE RELATION OF FAITH AND WORKS FIRST RAISED BY PAUL?

IT has frequently been asserted that the question of justification by faith or by works was discussed in the Jewish schools of our Lord's time.¹ But no use of the phrase "justification by faith" has been produced prior to the N.T. That justification was often discussed is certain. That the example of Abraham was frequently referred to is also certain; but that the question was ever raised whether Abraham was justified by faith or by works is altogether uncertain. Our ignorance of the topics debated within the schools does not permit us to assert that it was not discussed, but it equally prevents us from affirming that it was so discussed.

Yet, granting that it was not discussed, it is not necessary to hold, as has generally been done, that Paul must have been the first to speak of justification by faith. It is extravagance to declare that the discussion of such a topic is inconceivable before Paul. Was not James as capable of originating such a discussion as Paul? The term 'justification' was

¹ Even Dean Farrar, *Early Christianity*, maintains this view.

common property ; so, too, was the term faith. Why, then, if James found that some men contended that their intellectual orthodoxy was the evidence and guarantee of their salvation, should he not have declared this view to be unsound, and have maintained that not by belief, but by obedience was a man saved ? If he was aware that there were those who declared that a man was justified by his faith, what more natural than that James should formulate his own conviction in the proposition that a man is justified by works ? No high degree of intellectual power, such as that possessed by Paul, is required in order to oppose justification by works to justification by faith. James treats the subject throughout from a practical standpoint. He is thinking mainly, if not exclusively, of Christian life and conduct. He rejected the proposition that a man was saved by faith simply because of its inconsistency with the facts of Christian experience. Words cannot justify ; deeds alone justify. Profession is not practice ; obedience alone saves. These propositions, which commend themselves to the judgment of all practical men, are the propositions which James affirmed.

It should be observed that James nowhere speaks of the proposition which he is refuting as taught or held by any teachers. Nothing in his language suggests that it was a doctrine seriously entertained by earnest and obedient Christians. His whole method of treatment proceeds on the opinion that the tenet was morally unsound and unfruitful. James has instances in his

eye in which men are trusting for salvation to the orthodoxy of their beliefs, and not to the purity of their lives.

Further, may it not be suggested that James' method of dealing with the subject shows that the theme is novel and perplexing? Had the question been one discussed speculatively in the Christian community—above all, had Paul's view of justification by faith been already known, is it conceivable that James would have argued as he does? Is it not plain that he finds himself in a position of much difficulty? He allows that a dead faith is in a sense faith. How then can faith save? This proposition he had probably inherited from Judaism, and as a Christian he must have accepted it from the first. For faith was constantly on the lips of Jesus as the condition of salvation. How then did it stand related to justification? Only when it ceased to be a mere assertion and became a living power. This transition could be effected only through the mediation of works. In this way James solved the difficulty by which he was confronted. Had he known Paul's writings, his laboured argumentation would scarcely have been requisite. All that he needed to do was to refuse the function of justification to such a faith as he had described, to deny it even to be faith. He might indeed have acted in this way independently of Paul. But had he known Paul's teaching, there is a likelihood that he would have done so.

EXCURSUS VII.

JAMES ON FAITH AND WORKS.

THE section on Justification by Works (2¹⁴⁻²⁵) stands in close connection with the preceding section. In the first verse of the chapter James exhorts his readers not to hold faith in Christ along with respect of persons. He was aware, however, that there were those among them who were satisfied with their possession of faith, believing that this would obtain for them salvation. They held that their faith, though not united to a corresponding Christian life, would save them. The object of their faith is not stated by James ; but that it was in their judgment specifically Christian cannot be questioned. They may have believed in Jesus as the Messiah, the King and Judge of men, and even as their Redeemer. But, whatever the contents of their faith, they held that faith in itself, even though unaccompanied by a moral life, procured eternal salvation. This is the view which James sets himself to refute. In vv.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ he states clearly the position he maintains. Faith cannot possibly save apart from works, that is, apart from a Christian moral life. "What profit is there," he asks, "if a man say he has faith, but have not works ?

Can faith save him?" And he illustrates his view of its inability to do so by comparing such a faith to the action of a man who dismisses a naked or starving brother or sister from his door with the pious wish that they may be warmed and fed, but who does nothing to relieve their wants. So is it with faith unaccompanied by works. It is dead of itself. James does not speak here of simulated or pretended faith. He does not deny faith to those whose opinions he condemns. They have faith in a sense, even Christian faith. But this Christian faith cannot of itself save, simply because it is dead. The salvation spoken of is ordinary Christian salvation, and the primary reference is probably to the last judgment. Faith destitute of works will then prove unavailing. If it is to save, it must be accompanied by 'works,' and this term plainly denotes the life that corresponds to Christian faith. It had possibly acquired a fixed sense, descriptive of the virtues belonging to the Christian. Its essence was the Law as conceived and expounded by Jesus. A faith separate from works is as incapable of saving as beneficence in words is of feeding and clothing the poor. A faith without works is dead; it is as a body without a soul. It is not only dead as regards the effects which it produces on others; it is dead in itself. How can such faith save?

The position thus asserted is still further developed in vv.¹⁸⁻²⁰ where it is shown that faith can be evidenced only by works, and that faith without works is fruitless. To make this plain, James intro-

duces a man holding views similar to his own, who, addressing a man whose confidence in salvation rests on faith, says: "You have faith, and I have works: show me thy faith apart from works, and I will show thee my faith by works. Thou believest that God is one. The demons also believe, and shudder." The reality of faith, James contends, can be attested only by works. Thus only can its existence be made good. The mere assertion that it exists does not prove that existence. Its existence, if it is to be proved, can be proved only by works. But this is not all. Faith may exist, and yet its fruit be not salvation but condemnation. The fundamental article of all true religion is monotheism. There is but one God. But this belief does not save. It is held by the demons, who shudder in view of the judgment to come.

There is no reason to suppose, from the illustration which James here puts into the lips of the speaker, that the tenet of the unity of God was specially insisted on by those who sought salvation by faith. The faith on which they relied was to them Christian in name and contents. It was no mere intellectual belief in the unity of God, nor was it mere confidence in God or in the Messiah and His kingdom, but the persuasion that God had graciously accepted and forgiven them. The doctrine is cited only to show that the cardinal article of all true religion, the confession that was habitually made morning and evening by every Jew, had not of itself any saving power. If it could save, the demons would be saved.

The writer now seeks to show that the view which he maintains is confirmed by Scripture (vv.²⁰⁻²⁶), and adduces in evidence the instances of Abraham and Rahab. Speaking now in his own name, and addressing the upholder of the opposite view, he asks triumphantly whether his opponent is willing to listen to the testimony of Scripture, that faith without works is fruitless. He introduces his Scripture instances by the words, "Art thou willing to recognise, O empty man, that faith without works is fruitless?" The man who maintains such a view is called 'empty' because of his want either of spiritual insight or of spiritual endowments; possibly the former, as he is immediately convicted of ignorance of Scripture. The faith which before was designated 'dead' is here designated 'fruitless.' Both epithets are nearly synonymous. Faith is described either as 'negligent,' that is, failing to perform its due labour, or as 'unfruitful,' not producing what it should. Perhaps the latter image was present to the mind of James. He may have been thinking of the fruit of a tree, or of the interest of gold or silver. True faith should exhibit a profit, but this faith exhibits no profit. Now comes the other proof from Scripture. That faith without works is dead, is clear from the case of Abraham. He was justified by works when he laid the greatest of all sacrifices, that of his son, upon the altar of God. "You see," concludes James, "that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect. And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abraham

believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God." The inference that faith helped or wrought along with the works of Abraham is hardly what would have been expected. A clause similar to that in the second half of the verse, showing the relation of works to faith rather than of faith to works, seems the more natural. Why then is faith here represented as acting along with works? And what is the kind of service which it is supposed to render? Faith is probably thus described, because James wished to set it forth as a living and active power. It was impossible for Abraham's faith to remain unproductive. It sought embodiment, and it attained completion in the sacrifice of his son. It is not to be supposed that the works had, as it were, taken independent action, and that faith came to their assistance. Such an interpretation is, indeed, tenable, and is possibly the most obvious, but it is not in harmony with the rest of the Epistle. James, equally with his opponents, acknowledged the necessity and value of faith. The difference between them lay in their conception of its nature, and especially of its relation to the Christian life. Faith with James never came properly into existence until it embodied itself in some form or another of Christian obedience. Hence he adds that by means of works faith was made perfect. Abraham's was no inert faith; it enabled him to perform his great work of self-sacrifice. Only, however, through this act of self-sacrifice was his faith brought to perfection. Faith

is ever defective where works are wanting. It attains completion only by means of works. James is speaking of the actual influence of works upon faith, and not merely of any indication or proof that Abraham's faith was complete. Faith and works are so related that faith becomes perfect or complete only through works. Accordingly, James argues, the passage in Genesis (15⁶) which speaks of Abraham's faith was fulfilled. The phrase "he was called the friend of God" is not found in the O.T. text, Hebrew or Greek. It is first found in a version of Genesis 18¹⁷ given by Philo (*de Sobr. M.* i. 401). The LXX has 'servant' where Philo has 'friend.' There are two places in the LXX (2 Ch 20⁷ and Is 41⁸) where Abraham is spoken of as "beloved of God." It is possible that these passages told upon the mind of James, and led him to speak of Abraham as called the friend of God. But, whatever the source of the expression, it must not be detached from what precedes, "was reckoned unto him for righteousness." The two phrases are identical in signification. They do not designate diverse acts, but one and the same act on the part of God. Nothing in the quotation suggests that Abraham's faith was first of all imputed for righteousness, and that at a subsequent date, on account of his works, he received the title "friend of God." This is to force upon the language of James a meaning, derived from theological presuppositions, which would never dawn on the mind of an ordinary reader. Moreover, the sense put upon the language is incon-

sistent with the view of the relation of faith and works which James expounds. Nothing is plainer than that James recognises in the offering of Isaac the justification of Abraham, and sees in that act the fulfilment of the passage which spoke of faith being reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.

A new question arises, In what sense is justification to be understood? Is it to be taken in its usual sense of a declaration on the part of God? Or may it possibly bear the meaning, *to show or prove to be righteous*? That the verb can bear this meaning need not be doubted. But that such an interpretation is opposed to the text can hardly be questioned. What James has in view is undoubtedly the verdict of God upon man. He is not concerned with the evidence that man can furnish to man of his justification, but with the sentence that God Himself passes on a man's moral state. When he speaks of the justification of Abraham, he is thinking not of the estimate passed by men, but of the estimate passed by God upon his character. Accordingly justification, here as elsewhere in all similar passages, must be understood of a sentence or judgment on the part of God.

But when is the sentence of which James speaks passed? It is contended that the date is that of the final judgment. Man is not pronounced just until he stands before the bar of Jesus Christ; he receives sentence, then, in accordance with his obedience or disobedience to the Law of God. He is acquitted or condemned on the ground of his works. This is

declared to be the teaching of the entire N.T., and is held to be unquestionably the doctrine of James. For what James speaks of throughout is final salvation, and that salvation is determined only at the last judgment. This is a seductive view, more especially because it seems to afford the easiest of all methods of reconciling the teaching of Paul and James regarding justification, Paul speaking of a sentence pronounced by God at the very beginning of the Christian life, and James of a sentence pronounced at the final judgment. But there is one insuperable objection to it. The instance quoted by James refers to a decision by God, passed during the lifetime of Abraham. And hence the judgment spoken of cannot be the final judgment. No ingenuity can get over the plain statement that Abraham was justified by works when he offered his son, and this statement fixes the time of his justification.

From the example of Abraham the inference follows (2nd) that a man is justified by works and not by faith only. James denies that a man can be justified by faith alone. He does not decline to allow to faith any part or function in justification. But faith alone, he contends, never justifies. The sentence passed by God has never respect to faith exclusively.

That justification takes place through works is also, according to James, plain from the case of Rahab. She was justified by her reception of the spies and the provision she made for their safety. What was true of the founder of the nation was equally true of

a woman standing in sharpest contrast to him. Her care for the spies led to her acquittal by God. Here, too, the date of the justification must be within the lifetime of the person referred to. James evidently contemplates a sentence contemporaneous as it were with the instance of obedience to which he refers. God justified Rahab when she saved the lives of the spies. In connection with the case of Rahab, James sums up his view of faith and works in the remarkable statement, that as a body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead. The sense of these words appears plain. Yet their plain sense has been persistently neglected. The words cannot, it is said, bear the meaning which they at once suggest. It is impossible that James could have compared faith to the body and works to the soul, for their relation is just the opposite. Faith is the soul, and works the body; and this James intended to say and must be understood to say. But had such been his intention and endeavour, why did he write as he has done? He has never any difficulty in making his meaning clear. Why should he have left it ambiguous in this case? Nay, why should he have said the very opposite of what he meant? To affirm that James does not mean to compare the body to faith and the spirit to works, but simply to state that faith apart from works resembles the body to which the spirit is wanting, is to do obvious violence to his words. Nor is it permissible to identify the works here spoken of directly with love. James means what he says,

and says what he means. Works are to him the soul of which faith is the body. His view throughout this passage is not that faith is the soul of works, but rather that works are the soul of faith. Undoubtedly he recognised the living energy of true faith, but this living energy is to him developed and perfected by means of works. Faith detached from works is not Christianity. Faith with him is inseparably connected with and embodied in works. It only becomes mature, complete, perfect, and therefore true and real, by means of works.

It is clear, however, from the manner in which James refers to faith elsewhere, that he regarded it as the source of Christian actions. His use of the term 'faith' except in this passage would never suggest that he viewed it otherwise than the remaining writers of the N.T. Nor, in truth, does his usage differ from theirs. Faith with him as with them is the characteristic feature of the Christian. Its object is Jesus as our Lord (2¹). By means of it the prayer which is heard is offered (5¹⁵ 1⁶). It is the fundamental Christian grace or quality (1³ 2⁵), and whatever perfects it, however adverse, is to be welcomed (1³). James, in fact, takes for granted that his readers are familiar with faith as the active principle of the Christian life, and it was only the knowledge that this principle was misconceived and abused that led him to write the famous paragraph in chap. 2. It has been argued that his conception of faith is not uniform. But there is no

evidence that James himself was conscious of any inconsistency, nor can any such inconsistency be proved. Could he possibly have written the section in chap. 2 without examining his own usage in the rest of the letter? Whether he is consistent or not in his employment of the term, it must be taken for granted that he believed himself to be so. Nowhere does he define faith, nor, except in one case, specify its object; but this one specification is enough to make his message plain. Faith was with him, as with every Christian, faith in Christ. To refer the object of faith, in the other cases in which he uses the term, to God exclusively, and as separate from Christ, is improper. James cannot have separated faith in God and faith in Christ, as is clear from the opening words of his Epistle.

Is it legitimate to infer James' notion of faith from the fact that he allows a dead faith to be faith, and to argue that his notion of faith must unite the two possibilities of being alive or dead? Is this notion to be found in the conviction of the reality of supersensuous facts and blessings? (Beyschlag, i. 259). Such a conviction, it is affirmed, may be living and operative, or dead and inactive. But this observation applies to every definition of faith where intellectual recognition is separated from moral obedience. May it not have been that James was unwilling to challenge a current use of the term 'faith'? He was dealing with men who were nominal Christians, and who as such professed to have faith. Their creed was sub-

stantially orthodox, but they depended for their salvation on their adherence to their creed, and not on their obedience to its precepts. James was not prepared to describe intellectual assent as false, for viewed in itself such assent is an element in faith. He preferred to speak of it as imperfect or immature. It was dead and not living, and hence could not save. How then does James conceive the relation between faith and works? Does he regard them as two co-ordinate powers standing beside each other, of unequal value, and between which no real union can exist? Is it impossible to hold that with James works proceed from faith? The acknowledgment by James of a dead or fruitless faith is said to destroy the indissoluble connection between faith and works (Holtzmann, *NT Theol.* ii. 333). This statement must be accepted so far as the relation between dead faith and works is concerned. But James nowhere affirms that this dead faith is faith as known to him. On the contrary, all that he states regarding it shows that he does not recognise it to be Christian. It is destitute of all religious value, because morally unfruitful. But this condemnation of an unfruitful faith only proves the more decisively that faith as conceived by James was essentially fruitful. The condemnation of a dead faith is meaningless save in connection with the approval of a living faith. And this living faith, by its very definition, is fruitful. Accordingly, while it is legitimate to infer, from James' use of 'faith' to denote even dead faith, that no necessary connection

exists between such a faith and works, it is illegitimate to infer that in his view of the faith that is not dead there is no necessary connection between it and works. All the references to faith, apart from the second chapter, prove that he regarded it as a living principle, and therefore as the source of a moral life. Faith, indeed, did not exist with him until embodied in act; but, having thus attained maturity, it became ever after a spring of moral energy. Had James merely regarded faith as a calm religious state, as a mere conviction of God's purpose of salvation, he could not have spoken of that faith as inconsistent with respect of persons, nor could he have characterised it as the fundamental power of Christianity.

EXCURSUS VIII.

ON SPITTA'S VIEW OF THE EPISTLE.

THE assertion has been made that the Epistle of James was originally a purely Jewish production, but that afterwards two specifically Christian passages were added, and thus the book became current within the Church (Spitta, *Der Brief des Jakobus*).

According to this view, the two places in which the name of Jesus appears are interpolations. The first of these is Ja 2¹: "My brethren, hold not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons." Here the words "our . . . Jesus Christ" (*ἡμῶν . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) are said to have been added by a Christian who desired to adapt the book for use within the Church. The well-known difficulty of the passage is dwelt upon, and that difficulty is declared to be removed when the words just quoted are removed. There is left the exhortation, "Hold not the faith of the Lord of glory with respect of persons." This language is readily understood of God, to whom it is applied in the Book of Enoch (40^s 63^s 81^s). The specifically Christian phrase may then with confidence be re-

jected as an obvious addition to the original. To discuss seriously an argument of this sort, even though coming from the pen of a scholar, is only expedient because an examination of the hypothesis brings out into full relief the true character of the Epistle. The very difficulty of the expression is surely of itself a proof of genuineness. Regarded as original, it can be explained with ease. But what account of it can be given if it is referred to the pen of a Christian reviser? Is it conceivable that a reviser should have so altered the passage as to make its interpretation precarious and hard? This it is impossible to believe. Again, had the addition been made by the reviser, the pronoun 'our' would hardly have been employed. Its presence is intelligible if it came from the pen of the original author. But the improbability that a later reviser added the phrase "Jesus Christ" is increased by the supposition that he inserted also the pronoun 'our.' Nor is any support for the hypothesis derived from the context. For, to say the least, the exhortation to Christians not to unite faith in Jesus Christ with respect of persons, is as appropriate as the same counsel directed to Jews. A new section of the Epistle opens with the second chapter, and no connection is established by the writer between visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction and the absence of respect of persons. Further, to assume that the language of 1 P 1¹⁷: "If ye call on him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to

each man's work," is substantially identical with Ja 2¹, and that, consequently, the reference in James is to God and not Christ, is mere caprice. Besides, it may be asked, was the original author likely to employ a phrase not found in the Old Testament? Can it be shown that he had read the Book of Enoch, or that the phrase in question was current when he wrote? To raise minor difficulties of this kind is, however, superfluous in view of the essential incredibility of the hypothesis under discussion.

Still less successful, if that is possible, is the endeavour to show that the words "of the Lord Jesus Christ" in the address of the letter were added by a Christian reviser. The phrase "a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" is admittedly unique in the New Testament, and this uniqueness is taken to be a proof that the phrase is an interpolation. But does it not demonstrate exactly the opposite? Would an interpolator have devised an absolutely novel form of expression? Is it not the case that interpolations are almost invariably the completion, by the addition of one or more words, of current modes of statement in their fullest shape? Only an interpolator of a most unusual stamp would introduce into the superscription of a letter an absolutely new designation.

The conjecture, then, that the two passages in which the name of our Lord appears are interpolations may be dismissed, as the reasons alleged in its favour

are worthless. Even had the evidence for it been of some weight, absolutely decisive considerations could have been advanced against it. Is it conceivable that a Christian interpolator would have been satisfied with making these two additions only to a work which he knew to be Jewish in spirit and substance? No trace of any other changes made by him can be discovered (Spitta, 9). Had the interpolator wished to adapt the work to Christian ends, he must have caused it to assume a genuinely Christian aspect. No possible reason can be assigned why he should have made only the two additions named, leaving the Jewish character of the work unaltered. The only circumstance that could have induced him to make no change is the fact that the rest of the work was, as it stood, adapted to his purpose, that is, that it did not bear a specifically or exclusively Jewish character. This view is undoubtedly true, but it is fatal to the hypothesis in question, which postulates the intrinsically Jewish character of the work. The interpolator then, unless destitute of knowledge and capacity, if he did not transform the letter, must have regarded it as it stood as sufficiently Christian for his purposes.

But the assertion that the two passages quoted are the only Christian passages in the letter is wholly baseless. There are others which require a Christian explanation. Such are the phrases "the honourable name by which ye are called" (2⁷); "Of his own will He brought us forth by the word of truth, that

we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures" (1¹⁸); "the perfect law, the law of liberty" (1²⁶); "the implanted word" (1²¹); "the coming of the Lord" (5⁷); "our God and Father" (1²⁷ 3⁹); "the elders of the Church" (5¹⁴); "anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord" (5¹⁴).

Then, again, it may be asked, Could or would a Jew have written as the author of the Epistle writes regarding faith and works, regarding the duty of the elders, and regarding oaths? Are any Jewish circles known to which the discussion on faith and works might have been addressed? Did Jewish elders ever anoint with oil in the name of the Lord? Would a Jew have interdicted the use of the oath?

Further, did the name James stand in the original address? If so, who was the writer? What led him to address the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion? Why has his name perished? Again, if the name was introduced by the Christian interpolator, why did he select James? The only possible explanation is that it was because of his eminence in the Church. But is it conceivable that a Christian should have made such a use of the name of James? Would such a reviser have been satisfied with merely adding the name of Jesus in two places to a Jewish writing? Would he not have felt himself bound to give the whole letter the appearance of having come from the pen of James?

Moreover, how did it come to pass that the letter was accepted by the Christian Church? Was the

Church deceived by it? Had it no means of learning whether James the brother of the Lord had written to the Jews of the Dispersion or not? Such a theory attributes to the members of the primitive Church an ignorance and incapacity almost incredible. From the first the Christians were acquainted with the origin and history of the books which they read in public worship. Again, if the letter really presented the Jewish features alleged, how is its reception within the Church to be explained? How, too, its retention? Has the Church during all these centuries erred in the judgment which it has passed upon it? It is undeniable that, had its exclusively Jewish character been discerned by the Church, it would never have found a place within the Canon; but that character, as we have seen, exists only in the mind of a scholar, and does not belong to the letter itself.

The truth is, that the Epistle from first to last is pervaded by the spirit of Christianity. This has been the conviction of the Church in all ages. It stands on the same moral height as the other writings of the New Testament. Its ethical standards and demands are the same as theirs. When it is read along with the remaining contemporaneous Jewish literature, its measureless superiority is at once evident.

It is only slaying the slain to call attention to the impossibility of explaining, on this hypothesis, the relationship which undoubtedly exists between the Synoptic Gospels and the First Epistle of Peter and

the Epistle of James. The supposition that the Synoptic Gospels and the Epistle of Peter drew, like the author of the Epistle of James, from common Jewish sources, can be entertained by no capable judge. The author of the Epistle of James breathed the same spiritual atmosphere, and was familiar with the same teaching as the compilers of the Synoptic Gospels, and the resemblance between First Peter and James is most simply explained by the dependence of the one letter on the other.

EXCURSUS IX.

MAYOR'S VIEW OF THE RELATIONS OF THE EPISTLES OF FIRST PETER AND JAMES.

AN examination of the Epistle of James and the 1st Epistle of Peter brings to light a series of resemblances. Taken separately these might be considered accidental, but in view of their number they can hardly be so regarded. It is therefore probable that the one writer had seen the letter of the other. If, as seems likely, the Epistle of James is the earlier, Peter consequently makes use of that letter. But the use he makes of it is quite independent. He applies expressions found in the Epistle of James in his own way and with full command of his materials; He is never a mere copyist. Even when derived from others, the language he uses has been made his own by being passed through his own mind and stamped as it were with his image. To assume (as is done by J. B. Mayor, *St. James*, 96) that Peter took the Epistle of James as his model, but engrafted on it a more Christian doctrine which he shared with Paul, is quite gratuitous. The tone, structure, and contents of the two Epistles vary widely. At most it can be said that the Epistle of James may have suggested certain phrases to Peter.

To suppose that Peter of set purpose expanded the language of James (Mayor, 96), or that he corrects and supplements his O.T. quotations (97), is to do injustice to the origin and life of the Epistle. The affinity between Ja 1³ and 1 P 1⁶ ⁷, more particularly the phrases "manifold temptations" and "the proof of your faith," is evident. But it is improper to assume that Peter's qualifying phrase "being put to grief if need be" is intended to soften the uncompromising Stoicism of James' "count it all joy." Both phrases are forcible and natural in their context, and neither needs the other for its explanation. Again, James' "begat He us with the word of truth" may have suggested 1 P, 1²³: "Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God, which liveth and abideth." These and similar affinities (Ja 1²¹, 1 P 2¹ ², Ja 1¹², 1 P 5⁴, Ja 4⁶ ¹⁰, 1 P 5⁶ etc.) are to be explained by the course of thought of each writer, and not by any desire to render clearer or fuller the statements of the other. Still more incongruous is the suggestion that 1 P 2²¹ substitutes the tone of the N.T. for that of the Old (Ja 5¹⁰). Such a recondite explanation is unnecessary to explain comparisons so obvious and so pertinent. The more carefully the similarities between the two Epistles are studied, in the light of their purpose and destination, the more unsatisfactory and repugnant becomes the opinion that Peter reviewed the Epistle of James in order to adapt it for a special class of readers. (Mayor, 99.)

EXCURSUS X.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

IT is generally conceded that the Epistle to the Romans and the 1st Epistle of Peter exhibit such relationship to the Epistle of James as can be explained only by their being dependent the one on the other. The author of the Epistle of James either knew Romans and 1st Peter, or the authors of Romans and 1st Peter in turn knew the Epistle of James. The historical question, which of these Epistles was first written cannot be regarded as finally decided. At the present moment it is true that the majority of scholars hold the Epistle of James to be prior alike to Romans and to 1st Peter; but there are some scholars eminent for sobriety and insight of judgment who believe that the date of James is certainly later than that of the Epistle to the Romans and possibly also than that of 1st Peter. Under these circumstances, even taking literary dependence for granted, no conclusion can be drawn as to the existence of the Epistle of James. Nor can the literary dependence be regarded as indisputable. The points of affinity between the Epistles may be admitted, and yet literary dependence rejected. It cannot be said that the

resemblances are of a kind absolutely to compel the belief that the writers must have seen one another's letters.

The same argument applies still more strongly to the alleged relationship between the Epistle of James and other N.T. writings. The connection in the latter case is much more remote than in the case of the Epistle to the Romans and 1st Peter. The earliest traces of the letter are found in the Epistle of Clement, written from Rome to Corinth about 96 A.D. The references and allusions are not absolutely free from doubt, and several scholars have declared them to be inconclusive. At the same time, the vast majority of scholars acknowledge the dependence of the letter of Clement on that of James. And this opinion rests unquestionably on a solid basis. It is true that the mere mention of Abraham as the friend (of God), (10¹⁷), does not show that Clement had read Ja 2²³, for Philo had already (*de Sobr.* 11) used the same expression, and it may have been a current phrase. But the character of his observations regarding Abraham suggests that he was familiar with the Epistle of James. The title, Friend of God, is spoken of as a designation given him. His faith is said to be exhibited in his obedience (10). The language of Gn 15⁶ is quoted as in James, and mention is made of the sacrifice of Isaac as an act of obedience. The instance of Rahab's salvation might have occurred to Clement independently, or could have been derived from He 11³¹. But the

reason which he assigns for her salvation (12), namely, her faith and hospitality, renders it probable that he is here seeking to unite in the same clause the 'faith' of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews with the 'works' of James. The allusion (21) to those who boast in the arrogance of their words is probably a reminiscence of Ja 4¹⁶: "Ye boast in your arrogances." The words "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble," are cited by Clement (30) as they appear in Ja 4⁶ and 1 P 5⁵ and not in the exact language of the LXX (the LXX has *κύριος* for *θεός*. But James and Peter have the article *ὁ* before *θεός*, while Clement has not). Here several possibilities lie open. Clement may not be indebted either to James or Peter, but may have followed a text current in his age. Yet, that he was influenced by the Epistle of James is likely, because, shortly after, he proceeds to speak of being justified by works and not by words (cf. Ja 2^{21, 24}). Again, the exhortation (38), "Let the wise display his wisdom not in words but in good works," at once recalls Ja 3¹³: "Who is wise and understanding among you? let him show by his good life his works in meekness and wisdom." So, too, the quotation (49), "Love covers a multitude of sins," which may be derived from either Ja 5²⁰ or 1 P 4⁸, is doubtless to be referred in part to James, as Clement proceeds in the next chapter to describe love as a means of obtaining pardon for ourselves just as James does.

Further, the dependence of Clement on James is

shown by his endeavour to combine the teaching of Paul and James regarding justification. It is almost certain from his language on this subject that he has two authorities before him, and these two could hardly have been other than Paul and James. Abraham, he declared, was blessed because he wrought righteousness and truth through faith (31). "We are not justified through our own wisdom, or understanding, or piety, or works, which we wrought in holiness of heart; but through faith." "Still we must hasten to accomplish every good work" (32, 33). For his faith and hospitality a son was given to Abraham in his old age (10), and "Rahab was saved because of her faith and hospitality" (12). It is apparent from these passages that the writer is under the influence of two systems of doctrine, and that he is anxious to do justice to both by preserving a due balance between them. His position as the chief ruler of a community in which the two types of opinion existed, or at any rate his own knowledge of these two types, furnishes the only satisfactory explanation of his language. Cf. Lightfoot, *Clement*, i. 96; Westcott, *Canon*, 'Clement.'

It may therefore be taken as reasonably certain that the Epistle of Clement is dependent on the Epistle of James. The fact of an affinity between the letters can hardly be denied, and is, indeed, admitted by writers of very different schools. Some of the scholars, however, who reject the authenticity of James seek to explain the resemblance between the

letters in one or other of two ways. One method is to treat the letters as produced under the same circumstances. They are said to belong to the same date, and are therefore similar. But this explanation is wholly unsatisfactory. It explains the likeness, but not the unlikenesses between them. Who can read the two letters without perceiving this great and obvious dissimilarity? The tone of the writers, the readers they have in view, the circumstances in which they live, differ widely.

A second explanation (Harnack, *Chron.* 485) with greater plausibility traces their kinship to the supposed sources of the Epistle of James. But these supposed sources are a fiction devised to explain away unwelcome facts, and have no existence except in the brain of their author.

The *Shepherd* of Hermas, like the Epistle of Clement, was written in Rome. Its date is probably about the middle of the second century, and its relationship to James is unquestionable. The likeness can be impugned only by the superficial student. Undoubtedly the points of contact are not such as at once arrest the eye. This is rendered impossible by the character of the *Shepherd*, to the purpose of which direct quotations and references were foreign (Taylor, *Journal of Philol.* xviii. 297). But the more closely the *Shepherd* is scanned, the more frequent and the more numerous are seen to be the coincidences in thought and even in language between it and the Epistle of James. The ethical temper of Hermas is akin to that of

James. Both writers enforce duty more than they expound truth. Both attach the highest value to prayer, and regard faith as its soul. Both condemn repeatedly the divided heart. Both have the relation of the rich and poor steadily in view. Both censure luxury. Both feel for the widow and the orphan. It is impossible to examine with care any of the fuller lists of the related passages (cf. that in Mayor's *James*) without concluding that the relationship of the writings is close and great. That the dependence is on the side of Hermas and not on that of James (Pfleiderer, *Urchr.* 868) need not be argued. Who can believe that any man after reading the *Shepherd* could have written the letter of James?

To the testimony of Clement and of Hermas there should perhaps be added that of Justin Martyr, as much of his active life seems to have been spent in Rome. There are at least three places in his writings which reveal acquaintance with the Epistle. Our Lord's words forbidding the use of the oath are quoted by him (*Apology*, i. 16) in the form in which they appear in Ja 5¹², which differs slightly from that found in Mt 5³⁴⁻³⁷. The demons, he affirms (*Trypho*, 49), shuddered at Christ, an assertion which at once recalls the words of Ja 2¹⁹: "The demons also believe and shudder." Again, the history of the temptation of Eve is told in language which is closely akin to that of the history of temptation as given by Ja 1¹⁵: "Eve, when she had conceived the word coming from the serpent, bore transgression and death" (*Trypho*, 100).

Clement, Hermas, and Justin bear witness to the use of the Epistle in Rome during the first half of the second century. Only the more remarkable, therefore, is the circumstance that it is not named in the *Muratorian Canon*, which dates from the end of that century, and which furnishes a list of the books read at public worship in the Church of the capital. Nor did it find a place among the works recognised by Tertullian. The question has been raised whether a Latin Bible existed in his time, or whether he made his translations direct from the Greek original. But, however this question be determined, it seems clear that the authorities which he followed, whether Latin or Greek, did not contain the Epistle. The *Canon Mommseuinus*, belonging to the middle of the fourth century and written in Africa, does not contain the Epistle. The conclusion then must be drawn that the Epistle was not acknowledged in the Churches of Rome and Carthage during the third and fourth centuries. How is this fact to be reconciled with the equally certain fact that the Epistle was known to Clement, Hermas, and Justin?

To return a perfectly satisfactory answer to this question is, in our ignorance of the history of the Churches of Rome and Carthage, impossible. It may, however, be pointed out that, though the letter was known to Clement, Hermas, and Justin, it may not have been read in public worship. The possibility, indeed, that it was so read must be admitted. On the other hand, if it was not so read, its absence from

the lists already referred to is much more easily understood. On the supposition that it was contained in what may be called the early Roman Canon, its omission is hard to comprehend. Even though it were granted that the Roman Church consisted largely in the first instance of Jewish Christians, but that in course of time the Gentile element became the larger, it is not easy to see why the Epistle should have been excluded from the Canon. That it was addressed to Jewish Christians should not have rendered it less popular with the Church of Rome, had it been long known and read there. Is it conceivable that it could have been excluded in the time of Clement, by which date the Gentile element was undoubtedly supreme? Can any reason be given why it should be left out at a subsequent date? What could have induced the Roman Church to depose it from its place? Its destination for Jews can hardly have been the reason, for, if so, why was it accepted afterwards? Its contents cannot have been the ground, for these are genuinely Christian. Was, then, its apparent contradiction of the teaching of Paul the cause? This reply might serve at a later period, but it is questionable whether it applies to the end of the second century. There is no evidence to show that doctrinal controversies regarding justification had any place in the Church of Rome, or even that Paul's theology dominated that Church. It is, accordingly, much easier to believe that the Epistle was never used in public worship, than to believe that after being read it was

excluded from the collection of sacred books. Such a step, in view of the supposed knowledge by the Church of Rome of the authorship of the book and of its history, is hardly conceivable. On the other hand, it must be allowed that it is difficult to realise how a letter by James, and the leader of the Church of Jerusalem, known to Clement, should not have been publicly read in the Church of Rome.

In view of the facts already stated, it is not surprising that the Epistle is not mentioned by name by Tertullian or Cyprian or Hippolytus. Whether Tertullian was acquainted with it must remain an open question. It is possible that his emphatic repudiation of the opinion that God tempts (*de Orat.* 8) was suggested by the teaching of Ja 1¹³: "God tempteth no man," and that some of his illustrations in the same work (chap. 29) are due to recollections of Ja 5^{16, 20}. (Westcott, *Canon*, 369, holds that he was not acquainted with it; Zahn, *Gesch. Kan.* i. 329, leaves the question undecided.) That the Epistle was not known to Cyprian is not disputed. The passage from Hippolytus which was at one time regarded as decisive proof of his knowledge of the book is now admitted to be spurious.

Whether Irenæus knew the Epistle is also uncertain. But, on the whole, it may be regarded as probable. The form (*Hær.* iv. 16. 2) in which he quotes the words, "He believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God," where the last words are treated as a part

of the quotation, seems to be derived from Ja 2²³. (So Harvey, *Irenæus*; Zahn, *Einkl.*, and others. On the other hand, Reuss, *Canon*, 106, believes that the passage is taken not from James, but from Clement of Rome. But this view is improbable, as the quotation in Clement is different from that in Irenæus.) It is possible also that the phrases "doers of the words of God" and "made the firstfruits of creation" (*Hær.* iii. 1. 1) are a reproduction of Ja 1^{18. 23}. (Cf. Zahn, *Gesch. Kan.* i. 325; Harvey, *in loc.*)

To turn now from Rome, Carthage, and Lyons to Alexandria. In dealing with the question of Clement of Alexandria's acquaintance with the letter, the exact force of a passage in Eusebius (*HE*, vi. 14) must be settled in the first place. "Clement in his *Hypotyposes*, to speak generally, has given concise explanations of all the canonical Scriptures without omitting the disputed books; I mean the Epistle of Jude and the remaining Catholic Epistles" (Westcott, *Canon*, 350). This seems explicit testimony to the fact that Clement had written on all the Catholic Epistles. But a statement of Cassiodorus, the accomplished Prime Minister of Theodoric (*Inst. Div. Litt.* 8), in which he asserts that Clement made some comments on the canonical Epistles (that is to say, on the 1st Epistle of Peter, the 1st and 2nd of John, and the Epistle of James) in pure and elegant language, which he caused to be rendered into Latin, has been taken to disprove the assertion of Eusebius regarding Clement. It is generally held that the Latin *Adumbrationes*,

contained in the works of Clement, are the notes spoken of by Cassiodorus. But there are no notes on the Epistle of James. Instead of these appear notes on the Epistle of Jude, and hence it has been inferred that Cassiodorus wrote by mistake 'James' for 'Jude,' and that, further, Clement did not write comments on all the Catholic Epistles, but only on four of them. Yet both of these results may be pronounced more than disputable. To assume an error in the text of Cassiodorus is gratuitous, unless it can be shown that the translation of Cassiodorus contained all the notes of Clement. For that writer does not affirm that Clement wrote on no other of the Catholic Epistles than the four he names. His language does not exclude the view that Clement had published comments on all the seven. Besides, even if Cassiodorus had stated that he had caused to be translated all the notes of Clement on the Catholic Epistles, it would not follow that Eusebius was in error, for some of the notes of Clement might have been lost in three hundred years. The trustworthiness of Eusebius is so great, his means of forming a judgment was so complete, the form of his statement is so specific, that it should never have been called in question on account of the passage in Cassiodorus. Besides, his testimony is confirmed by that of Photius (*Cod.* 109), who in his account of the *Hypotyposes* of Clement states that it contained interpretations of the Catholic Epistles; and these words are most naturally understood of the entire group of the Epistles.

The circumstance that it is a matter of dispute whether Clement in his writings ever quoted from the Epistle cannot be used to impugn the accuracy of the statement of Eusebius. For his silence might be purely accidental. The best scholars are divided in opinion on the point as to whether he refers anywhere to the Epistle, and this difference of opinion shows that the affinities alleged are somewhat remote. This is indeed the case, and there is no instance which can be regarded as decisive. Yet the general resemblance of not a few passages (see the list in Mayor) makes it probable that he was consciously or unconsciously affected by the phraseology of the Epistle.

Clement's illustrious disciple Origen is the first who refers to the Epistle by name. He speaks of it as the Epistle "in circulation under the name of James" in *Joann.* t. xix. 6. This phrase may indicate that he regarded the authorship of the letter as doubtful. His hesitation, if it existed, may have arisen from uncertainty as to the writer, or from the different opinions regarding it entertained by the Church, or from its contents. To what extent difference of opinion prevailed regarding it is unknown, but it possibly existed, and a consideration of this kind would naturally affect the manner in which Origen expresses himself. He cites the Epistle elsewhere (*Sol.* in Ps. 30⁶. 118¹⁵⁸) without remark. These are apparently the only three passages in which he mentions the writer by name in his extant Greek writings. In his

works as translated into Latin he is often made to refer to James the Apostle, and in one place to James the brother of the Lord (Ro 4⁵). Alike in his original and translated writings he makes use of the Epistle. From these facts it appears that Origen nowhere, as far as is known to us, expresses his own judgment on the Epistle. Perhaps he had come to no final decision regarding it. His practice was to attach the highest value to those writings only which had never been contested. And hence he must have assigned a lower place to the Epistle of James than to other writings of the New Testament. But it may confidently be said that he would never have quoted and referred to the book as he does, had he held it to be spurious. He doubtless accepted it as authentic, but, because of its history, assigned it a less lofty position than that which he gave to the unquestioned books.

It only remains to consider the testimony of the Syrian Church. Hitherto that testimony has been regarded as peculiarly favourable to the Epistle. The Peshiṭta was generally believed to belong to the second century, and, as it contained the Epistle, it was held that the Church that stood in the closest proximity to that from which the Epistle came had at once admitted it into its Canon. But recent investigation into the history of the Peshiṭta has caused its early date to be questioned, and many competent scholars believe that it must be assigned not to the second, but to the fifth century. Further

it has been shown that there was an old Syrian Canon anterior to that embodied in the Peshiṭta, and that this Canon contained none of the Catholic Epistles. The absence of quotations from the Catholic Epistles in the *Doctrine of Addai* and in the works of Aphraates proves conclusively that they, and consequently the Epistle of James, did not find a place in the earliest Syrian Canon.

INDEXES.

I.—TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Gn 9 ⁶	153	Mk 15 ⁴⁰	18
14 ¹⁴	21	19 ³⁵	18
15 ⁶	347	Lk 2 ⁷	2
15 ¹⁶	310, 329	2 ¹³	46
18 ¹⁷	329	4 ¹⁶	54
22 ⁹	311	5 ¹⁷	26
Lv 10 ⁴	21	8 ¹	50
17 ⁷	153	22 ¹⁸	71
17 ¹⁰	153	23 ³⁴	231
17 ¹¹	153	Jn 1 ⁴⁵	45
17 ¹³	153	2 ¹²	14, 22, 43, 45
17 ¹⁸	153	7 ³	58
18 ⁶⁻³⁶	154	7 ⁵	59
Nu 15 ³⁷⁻⁴¹	21	7 ¹⁵	20
Dt 6 ⁴⁻²¹	24	19 ³⁵	20
2 Ch 20 ⁷	329	19 ²⁷	42
Ps 80 ⁶	357	Ac 11 ³⁰	90
118 ¹⁵³	357	12	99
Is 41 ⁵	329	12 ¹⁷	93
Am 9	147	12 ²⁵	90
Mt 1 ¹⁸	2	14	127
1 ²⁶	2	15	169
4 ¹³	46	15 ³	138
5 ³⁴⁻³⁷	351	15 ³	130
6 ¹	312	15 ⁴	254
12 ⁴⁻⁶	50 ff.	15 ⁷	144
12 ²⁷	317	15 ¹¹	171
12 ⁴⁹	15	15 ¹²	145
13 ⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶	3	15 ¹³⁻²¹	146
13 ⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸	54	15 ¹⁶⁻¹⁸	147
13 ³⁵	9, 15, 22	15 ²¹	150, 162
25 ³⁴	312	15 ²²	264
27 ⁵⁶	18	15 ²⁹	151
Mk 3 ³⁰	47	16 ⁴	166, 254
3 ³¹	47, 48	21	165
3 ³¹	47, 48, 50	21 ²⁵	186, 211
6 ¹	42	22	169
6 ¹⁻⁶	54	Ro 2 ¹³	317
6 ³	18, 22	2 ²⁷	312
6 ⁴	57	3 ²⁶	308
6 ¹³	124	4 ^{1ff.}	279

	PAGE		PAGE
Ro 4 ¹⁻³	305	Ja 2 ²	118, 278
4 ²	311	2 ⁴	299
4 ⁵	358	2 ⁵	333
5 ²⁻⁵	302	2 ⁶	281, 283
7 ²²	302	2 ⁷	281, 283, 340
14	186	2 ⁸	281
1 Co 4 ⁴	817	2 ¹²	109, 281
5 ¹⁻¹³	166	2 ¹⁴	281, 317, 324
6 ¹⁸⁻²⁰	166	2 ¹⁴⁻¹⁷	324
8	186	2 ¹⁸⁻²⁰	325
8 ¹⁻³	166	2 ¹⁹	351
8 ¹⁰	178	2 ²⁰⁻²⁶	327
9	265	2 ²¹	279, 305, 324, 348
9 ⁵	5, 32	2 ²³	347, 355
10	186	2 ²⁴	331, 348
10 ¹	279	2 ²⁵	284
10 ¹⁴⁻²²	166	2 ²⁶	281, 324
10 ¹⁸	287	3 ¹	103
15	80	3 ²	319
15 ⁵⁻⁷	87	3 ³	103
15 ⁷	67, 75	3 ⁹	341
2 Co 3 ²⁴	265	3 ¹³	348
Gal 1 ¹⁹	1, 17, 79	4 ¹	302
2	201, 220, 253	4 ⁴	279, 299
2 ¹	140	4 ⁶	345, 348
2 ⁵	139, 171, 176	4 ¹⁰	345
2 ⁹	139	4 ¹¹	109, 281
2 ¹²	172	4 ¹³	113, 117
2 ¹⁴	188	4 ¹⁶	348
6 ¹⁶	287	5 ¹	117
1 Ti 4 ³	16	5 ³	120
He 11 ¹³	287	5 ⁴	120, 279, 299
11 ³¹	347	5 ⁶	103
Ja 1 ¹	281, 283, 299	5 ⁷	117, 282, 341
1 ²	281, 299, 345	5 ¹⁰	345
1 ²⁻⁴	302	5 ¹²	281, 351
1 ³	333	5 ¹⁴	123, 278, 341
1 ⁶	333	5 ¹⁵	319, 333
1 ⁹	116	5 ¹⁶	319, 354
1 ¹²	345	5 ²⁰	348, 354
1 ¹³	354	1 P 1 ⁶	345
1 ¹⁵	351	1 ⁷	345
1 ¹⁷	103, 299	1 ¹⁷	338
1 ¹⁸	281, 283, 345, 355	1 ²³	345
1 ²¹	341, 345	2 ¹	345
1 ²²	103, 355	2 ²	345
1 ²⁸	103, 299	2 ²¹	345
1 ²⁶	109, 281, 341	4 ⁸	348
1 ²⁷	341	5 ⁴	345
2	291, 333	5 ⁵	348
2 ¹	281, 283, 333, 337, 339	5 ⁶	345

II.—SUBJECTS.

- AFRICANUS, Julius**, on the choice of the rulers of the Church from our Lord's brethren, 271.
- Agabus**, 92, 206.
- Alphæus**, 18.
- Ambrosiaster**, 9.
- Annas** procures death of James, 234, 236.
- Antioch**, Church at, contribution to Church at Jerusalem, 90, 91. Christians at, 113; and the question of circumcision, 134, 136; attitude towards Gentiles, 134; membership of, 135; relations with Church at Jerusalem, 136; Peter in, 188 ff.; division in, 185, 190, 197; Gentiles and Jews in, 192 f.
- Apelles**, 12.
- Apostle**, history of the term, 80.
- Aramaic**, as the language of James' home, 26 ff.; in Galilee, 103f., 295 f.
- Art. Smalk.** on the virginity of Mary, 16.
- Ascents of James**, 231; unreliability of, 232 f., 247.
- Baedeker** on tomb of James, 241.
- Barnabas**, 82; visits Jerusalem, 89 f.; and the Church at Antioch, 135 f.; on circumcision, 137.
- Beracoth**, 24.
- Beyschlag**, 318, 334.
- Bible**, Aramaic, a text-book in Jewish schools, 27, 28.
- Brothers of our Lord**, full or step-brothers? 4 ff.; cousins? 17 ff.; unbelief of the, 7, 53, 60 ff.; list of, in the Gospels, 22; interfering with Jesus' work in Capernaum, 47; last mentioned, 58; unity among, 63; married, 63; effect of crucifixion and resurrection on, 67; conversion of, 76 f.
- Cana**, miracle at, 45 f.
- Capernaum**, 45 ff., 50, 54.
- Cassiodorus** referred to, 15, 245.
- Celibacy**, sentiment on, among the early Christians, 14, 16.
- Christianity and Judaism**, relation between, 133 ff.
- Christians**, persecution of, 79, 119, 120, 121, 131; relation of Jewish and Gentile, 113, 128, 149 ff., 161; conformity to Mosaic law, 113; meet by themselves, 114; rich and poor, 116 ff.; and the courts, 118 f.; Jewish, 119 f.; in Damascus, 121; hostility of Pharisees and Sadducees to, 122; assembly of, called a Church, 128.
- Church**, Greek Catholic, 16; Roman Catholic, 16; rich and poor in, 116; distinguished from synagogue, 128; elders in, 128; Gentile and Jewish sections in, 131 ff., 215.
- Circumcision**, debated on at the Congress of Jerusalem, 131; necessity of, 133; Church at Antioch on, 136 f.; Church at Jerusalem on, 137; Paul on, 137; Peter and James on, 138; Gospel of the, 141 ff.; question of imposing it on the Gentiles, 149.
- Clement of Alexandria**, 9, 15; on relation of James to our Lord, 244; on ecclesiastical position of James, 244, 247; on death of James, 247 ff.; and the Epistle of James, 355.
- Clement, First Epistle of**, 177, 347 ff.

- Clementine Homilies* on the position of James, 247.
Clementine Recognitions, on death of James, 231 f.
 on position of James, 247.
 sources of the, 248.
 Congress at Jerusalem, 133 ff.; questions in debate, 133, 143; preparation for, 138 ff., 144; meeting of, 144; four abstinences, 151 f.; reasons for selection, 153 f.; credibility of Luke's report, 169; prohibitions of, 171; genuineness of James' speech, 172; decision unanimous, 174; decision embodied in a letter, 174; genuineness of decision, 175 f.; reliability of record, 181 f., 293 f.; date of decree, 182 ff.; interpretation of decree, 184, 196, 199, 200, 201, 204; date of, 288.
- Dale on conversion of James, 68.
 Dalman, 28.
 Dillmann on Gn 9^a, 153.
- Edersheim, 30.
 Elders, duties of, in the synagogue, 123 ff.; power of healing, 124; origin of, 125 f., 261 f.; appointment of, 127; in the Epistle of James, 123 f.
- Encyclopædia Biblica* on the Council at Jerusalem, 203.
- Epiphanius on James as a step-brother of our Lord, 9, 11; on James as a Nazirite, 34; on the death of James, 225; on the *Ascents of James*, 231; on the charges against Paul, 251.
- Epistle of James, *see* James, Epistle of.
- Essenes, 34.
- Eusebius, on the brothers of our Lord, 9, 11.
 on the death of James, 222, 235, 239 f.
 on the throne of James, 242.
- Eusebius, on the ecclesiastical position of James, 244, 256.
 on Symeon, bishop of Jerusalem, 269.
 on the grandsons of Jude, 271.
 on the Desposynoi, 271.
 on James the Just, 274.
 on Clement of Alexandria and the Epistle of James, 355 f.
- Famine, the, at Jerusalem, 90 f.
- Farrar, on Mk 3^m Mt 12⁴, 50; on the oath of James, 74; on Paul's visit to Jerusalem, 83 f.; on Paul's association with the four Nazirites, 214; on faith and works, 321.
- "Firstborn," 2, 3.
- Form. Concord.* on the virginity of Mary, 16.
- Galatians, Epistle to, 94.
- Gentiles and the Mosaic law, 133 ff.
- Ginsburg on Essenism and Christianity, 42.
- Godet, 46.
- Gospel according to the Hebrews*, on the oath of James, 36.
 on the appearance of our Lord to James, 70 f.
 date of, 73 f.
- Gospel of the Egyptians*, used by the Naasenes, 246.
- Greek language, in Jewish schools, 30; in Galilee, 104 f.; in certain Epistles, 297.
- Hagiographa, 26.
- Harnack, on James as an apostle, 72.
 on the *Gospel to the Hebrews*, 73.
 on the preaching of Peter, 263.
 on Epistles of James and Clement, 350.
- Harvey, 355.
- Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, 25.
- Hazzam, 25.
- Hebrew in Jewish schools, 26 ff.
- Hedibia, 19.
- Hegesippus, on James as our Lord's brother, 10 f.

Hegesippus, on 'brother' and 'cousin,' 21.
 on James as a Nazirite, 34, 35, 37 f.
 on James as an Essene, 41.
 on James as an apostle, 72.
 on the position of James, 88.
 on death of James, 222; date of, 238, 239 f.
 on Symeon, 269 f.
 on James the Just, 274 f.
Helvetic Confession, 16.
 Hermas, *The Shepherd*, 350 f.
 Herod, 5.
 Herod Agrippa, 84.
 Hippolytus on James and the Naasenes, 246; and the Epistle of James, 354.
 Holsten on Peter's intercourse with the Gentiles, 192.
 Holtzman, on relation of the Epistles of Paul and James, 310 f.
 on faith and works, 335.
 Hort, on James as one of the Twelve, 87.
 on Ac 15²⁰, 156.
 on "certain who came from James," 192.
 on Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, 207.
 on Epiphanius' account of the *Ascents of James*, 231.
 on the preaching of Peter, 263.
 on the jurisdiction of James, 264.
 Huther on justification, 318.
 Ignatian Epistles on the origin of the bishopric, 252.
 Irenæus and the Epistle of James, 354.
 Izates of Adiabene, 95.
 James (the brother of our Lord), an apostle, 17, 19, 80, 87, 259, 266 ff.; Jerome's theory, 17; childhood, 23; education, 23 ff.; home life, 31, 42 ff., 45; a carpenter, 32; marriage, 32 f.; asceticism of, 33, 222, 227; not a Nazirite, 34 ff., 222, 227 f.; not a

Pharisee, not a Sadducee, not an Essene, 40 ff., 227; conversion, 68; oath, 70 ff.; not elected an apostle, 78, 87 ff.; position in the Church, 81, 86 ff., 99 f., 131, 139, 244, 245, 247, 251 ff.; attitude towards Paul, 81 f., 171 f., 207, 220, 291, 301 ff.; mind of, 100 ff.; culture of, 105 f.; Paul's reference to, 139, 272; on circumcision, 140 ff.; speech at Council, 145 f.; its genuineness, 169; in his Epistle, 173; in the Acts, 173; relations with Peter, 192 f.; and Jewish law, 219, 273, 275; called the Just, 222, 245, 272 ff.; account of death by Hegesippus, 222 ff.; of Hegesippus, 226 ff.; account of death by Josephus, 223 f.; accused by Annas, 234, 236; date of death, 237 f.; place of burial, 240; throne, 242; account of death of, in *Recognitions*, 249; president of the Church at Jerusalem, 253, 264; estimate of contemporaries, 272 f.

James, the son of Zebedee, the greater, 18, 19; beheaded, 85; brother of John, 253.

James, the son of Alphæus, the less, 18, 19, 245.

James, the Epistle of, 93 ff.; date of, 98; literary character of, 101 ff.; Hebraic tone of, 102; literary indebtedness of, 105 f.; attitude towards the law, 108 ff.; readers of, 277 ff.; date of, 288 ff., 346; on circumcision, 289; language of, 295; a translation, 295, 299; and the Epistles of Paul, 291, 301 ff.; and justification, 305 ff.; faith and works in, 321, 324 ff.; and 1 Peter, 344 f.; external evidence for, 346 ff.;

- and other N.T. writings, 346; and the Epistle of Clement, 347 ff.; and *The Shepherd* of Hermas, 350; not in canon, 352 ff.; evidence of Fathers on, 352 ff.
- on rich and poor in the synagogue, 115 ff.
- on elders, 123 ff.
- on anointing, 124.
- on teachers, 128 f.
- to whom addressed, 129; harmony with Acts, 172.
- Jebamoth*, 32.
- Jerome, 17 ff.
- Jerusalem, Church at, 39; increase of, 79; disagreement of, with Paul, 82; James' position in, 86 ff., 99; contribution to, 90, 209; persecution of, 93; relations of, with Church at Antioch, 96 f.; Greek and Aramaic in the, 105; elders in, 126 f.; relations of, with other Churches, 131 f.; question of circumcision in, 133 f.; sends Barnabas to Antioch, 135; and the Mosaic law, 136 ff.; and the Congress, 144; letter from the, to Antioch, 174; Paul and the, 179; and the decision of the Congress, 182 f.; attitude towards the Gentiles, 182 f.; visit of Paul to the, 206 ff.; government in the, 260.
- Jesus (our Lord), brothers of, 1 ff.; birth of, 2; "firstborn" of Mary, 2 f.; sisters of, 3, 50; son of David, 5; entrusts Mary to John, 6, 64; an only child, 16 f.; manner of life, 36; death of Joseph, 42 f.; leaves Nazareth, 43, 45; first miracle, 43, 45; encounters hostility at Capernaum, 47 ff.; relations with family, 47 ff., 55, 61 f.; two visits to Nazareth, 54; enmity of fellow-townsmen, 56 f.; popularity waning, 58; the Messiah, 53, 59 ff., 115; unbelief of brethren, 60; crucifixion, 67; resurrection, 67 f.; appearance to James, 67 ff.; appearance to Paul, 69; ascension, 76; influence on the Epistle of James, 107, 110.
- Jews, Christian, 115 ff.; relations with Gentiles, 149 ff., 185.
- John the Baptist, 38, 39.
- Joseph, 1 ff. *passim*.
- Joseph the Carpenter, History of*, 43.
- Josephus, on the dearth in Jerusalem, 91; on the death of James, 234, 237; quoted by Origen, 271.
- Joses, 18, 22.
- Jubilees, Book of*, 276.
- Judas the brother of our Lord, 22.
- Judas Iscariot, 78, 88.
- Jude, 21.
- Justin Martyr and the Epistle of James, 351.
- Justification, Paul and James on, 305 ff.; in Epistle of James, 316 ff.; sense of, 330.
- Kalisch on the blood as the life, 153.
- Kingdom of God, 61.
- Law, instruction in the, 26.
- Law of liberty, 110.
- Law, the oral, 29.
- Law, the 'royal,' 112.
- Lechler on James' speech at the Congress at Jerusalem, 149.
- on Hegesippus' narrative of James' death, 226.
- on James as a Nazirite.
- Lewin on Paul and the four Nazirites, 213.
- Lightfoot on the supernatural birth of our Lord, 2.
- on James' relation to our Lord, 10, 11.
- on marriage among the Jews, 32.
- on John's relation to Mary, 65.
- on James as an apostle, 72.

- Lightfoot, on the decree of the Council, 157.
 on the *Clementine Recognitions*, 232.
 translation of Eusebius, 244.
 on the jurisdiction of James, 264.
 on James' title "Just," 276.
 on Epistle of Clement, 349.
- Lipsius on the death of James, 250.
- Mary, mother of our Lord, 1 ff.;
 committed to John, 65 ff.;
 her virginity, 15 ff.
 mother of James and Joseph, 18 f.
- Matthias, choice of, 87.
- Mayor on 'brother' as including 'cousin,' 21.
 on the appearance of our Lord to James, 70.
 on justification, 308 ff.; on relation of James and 1 Peter, 344 f.; on relation of James and *The Shepherd*, 351; on relation of James and Clement of Alexandria, 357.
- McGiffert on the enactments of the Council at Jerusalem, 163.
 on Paul's part in the Nazirite vow, 221.
 translation of Eusebius, 222, 240.
 on the eldership, 262.
- Messiah, 59, 61, 62, 64.
- Mezuza, 24.
- Mishna, 28.
- Muratorian Canon*, 352.
- Nazarenes, 84, 85.
- Nazirites, 38, 39.
- Nero, 118.
- Noah, seven precepts of, 154.
- Origen, on the brothers of our Lord, 9, 14, 15.
 on James and the Naasenes, 246.
 on James the Just, 274.
 on Epistle of James, 357.
- Parousia, 120.
- Paschal Chronicle* on date of James' death, 239.
- Paul, on our Lord's brothers, 5.
 on James as an apostle, 19.
 on the marriage of James, 32.
 conversion of, 79.
 first visit to Jerusalem, 79 ff.
 relations with James, 81, 82, 138, 220, 301 ff.
 relations with Peter, 81, 82, 138, 194, 198.
 second visit to Jerusalem, 89 ff.
 views on circumcision, 187, 142 ff.
 apostle to Gentiles, 140.
 speech at the Council, 145.
 on the decision of the Council, 176; and justification, 291, 305 ff.; and council, 313; and faith and works, 320 ff.
 last visit to Jerusalem, 206 ff.
 hostility to, at Jerusalem, 206, 210.
 and Jewish rites, 211.
 and the Nazirite vow, 212.
 in *Ascents of James*, 232.
- Peshitta, 358 f.
- Peter, reception of Paul in Jerusalem, 82 f.
 imprisoned, 85.
 speech at the Council, 144.
 visit the Church at Antioch, 188 f.
 visit of certain from James, 188 ff.
 relations with James, 192.
 action condemned by Paul, 198.
 bishop of Jerusalem? 245.
 on the position of James, 247.
 relation of First Epistle of, to James, 344 f.
- Peter, Gospel of*, 9, 12, 15.
- Pfleiderer, 351.
- Philo on religious education among the Jews, 24; on Gn 18th, 329, 347.
- Plumptre on Acts 15, 169.

- Poor, the, of the Dispersion, 115 ff.
Preaching of Peter on the eldership, 262.
Protevangelium Jacobi, on James' childhood, 5.
 on marriage of Joseph and Mary, 9.
 reliability of, 12.
 used by Origen, 15.
- Ramsay, on the date of the famine at Jerusalem, 91.
 on the visit of Paul to Jerusalem, 195.
- Rechabites, 37 f.
- Renan on our Lord's relatives in the Church, 272.
- Rendall on the enmity of the Jews against Paul, 210.
- Resurrection, influence of, on James, 68 ff.
- Reuss on Irenæus and the Epistle of James, 355.
- Révillé on the council of elders, 257.
- Rich, the, of the Dispersion, 115 ff.
- Ritschl on James as bishop, 255.
- Rothe on James' speech at the Council at Jerusalem, 149.
- Salmon on the position of James in the Church, 248.
- Salome, 66.
- Samson as prototype of James, 33, 39.
- Samuel as prototype of James, 33, 39.
- Sanhedrin, jurisdiction of, 120.
- Sayings of Jewish Fathers* on Jewish customs, 31, 32.
- Schools, education in Jewish, 25 ff.
- Schürer on the Seven Precepts of Noah, 154.
- Septuagint, in school, 30.
 accessibility to the, in Galilee, 104 f.
 citations from the, in James, 106.
- Shema, 24.
- Simcox, 300.
- Simon, brother of our Lord, 22.
- Sisters of our Lord, 22, 50 f.
- Smalkald, Articles of*, on the virginity of Mary, 16.
- Soden, von, on Græco-Roman ideas in James, 103.
- Spitta on the Epistle of James, 337 ff.
- Stanley on the burial of James, 240.
- Stephen, martyrdom of, 79.
- Symeon, bishop of Jerusalem, 21, 256, 269 f.
- Synagogue, in James' education, 24;
 our Lord preaching in, 56;
 Jewish, 114; Christian, 113 ff.; distinguished from Church, 128, 278.
- Syrian Church, and Epistle of James, 358 f.
- Talmud, on marriage, 32.
 on the Nazirites, 39.
- Taylor on *The Shepherd* of Hermas, 350.
- Teachers in the Epistle of James, 128 f.
- Teaching of the Apostles* on the choice of elders, 127.
- Tertullian, on our Lord's brothers, 12 f.
 and the Epistle of James, 354.
- Weiss on Gentile and Jewish sections in the Church, 162.
- Weizsäcker, on date of the decree of the Council at Jerusalem, 184.
 on the eldership, 262.
- Wendt, on the letter of the Council, 175.
 on the decision of the Council at Jerusalem, 202.
 on the genuineness of Acts 21, 25.
- Westcott, on "Clement," 349.
 on Tertullian's acquaintance with Epistle of James, 354.
 on James and the Canon, 355.
- Wordsworth on the language of the Epistle of James, 298.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Zahn, on the celibacy of James, 33.
 on the appearance of our Lord
 to James, 71.
 on the oath of James, 75.
 on the date of the famine at
 Jerusalem, 91.
 on the enactments of the Council
 at Jerusalem, 162, 164.
 on Josephus' testimony to James
 as brother of our Lord, 234.</p> | <p>Zahn, on the episcopal chair of
 James, 242.
 on Jas 1¹, 286.
 on Rom 4¹⁻³, 305.
 on Tertullian's acquaintance
 with Epistle of James, 354.
 on Irenæus and the Epistle of
 James, 355.
 Zizith, 24.</p> |
|---|---|

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
Edinburgh.

OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

By W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Lady Margaret Professor,
and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In post 8vo, price
5s. net.

Although this book is, in the main, a reprint of Dr. Sanday's well-known article, 'Jesus Christ,' in Dr. Hastings' Bible Dictionary, the Author has worked carefully over the material, and has broken up the text into Chapters and Sections. An important new Map of Palestine is added.

CONTENTS :—Chap. I. Introductory.—II. Survey of Conditions.—III. The Early Ministry.—IV. Teaching and Miracles.—V. The Later Ministry.—VI. The Messianic Crisis.—VII. Supplemental Matter: The Nativity and Infancy.—VIII. The Verdict of History.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

Introductory and Expository Studies. By the Rev. R. D. SHAW,
D.D., Edinburgh. Second Edition. 8vo, price 8s. net.

'Of all the Introductions to St. Paul's Epistles I have read, this is the best.'
—*Methodist Times*.

'Ought to prove a very useful guide to the professional student as well as to the inquiring layman. Nothing essential is missed which could aid the student to understand the circumstances which evoked the letters and the aim they sought to achieve.'—*British Weekly*.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

In Christian Truth and Life. By the Rev. J. SCOTT LIDGETT,
M.A., Warden of Bermondsey Settlement. 8vo, price 8s. net.

This book is an attempt to establish the Fatherhood of God as the determining fact of Christian life and the determining principle of Christian Theology. Among the subjects dealt with are: The New Testament Doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. Place in New Testament Theology. The Relation of the Old Testament Doctrine to the Fatherhood of God. The Doctrine in Church History. Validity and Content. Manifestation.

'Every reader will own the masterly skill with which Mr. Lidgett handles his subject, the breadth of his reasoning, the wide knowledge which he brings to bear on every page of his work, and the zeal which fuses and transfuses the whole.'—*Methodist Recorder*.

A GREAT BIBLICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

'The standard authority for biblical students of the present generation.'—*Times*.

Now complete in Five Volumes (including the EXTRA Volume, containing important Articles and complete Indexes), imperial 8vo (of nearly 800 pages each). Price per Volume: in cloth, 28s.; in half morocco, 34s.,

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE,

*Dealing with its Language, Literature, and Contents,
including the Biblical Theology.*

Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., with the Assistance of J. A. SELBIE, D.D., and, chiefly in the Revision of the Proofs, of the late A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh; S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Litt.D., Oxford; and H. B. SWETE, D.D., Litt.D., Cambridge.

*Full Prospectus, with Specimen Pages, from all Booksellers, or
from the Publishers.*

'We offer Dr. Hastings our sincere congratulations on the publication of the first instalment of this great enterprise. . . . A work was urgently needed which should present the student with the approved results of modern inquiry, and which should also acquaint him with the methods by which theological problems are now approached by the most learned and devout of our theologians.'—*Guardian*.

'We welcome with the utmost cordiality the first volume of Messrs. Clark's great enterprise, "A Dictionary of the Bible." That there was room and need for such a book is unquestionable. . . . We have here all that the student can desire, a work of remarkable fulness, well up to date, and yet at the same time conservative in its general tendency, almost faultlessly accurate, and produced by the publishers in a most excellent and convenient style. We can thoroughly recommend it to our readers as a book which should fully satisfy their anticipations. . . . This new Dictionary is one of the most important aids that have recently been furnished to a true understanding of Scripture, and, properly used, will brighten and enrich the pulpit work of every minister who possesses it. . . . We are greatly struck by the excellence of the short articles. They are better done than in any other work of the kind. We have compared several of them with their sources, and this shows at once the unpretentious labour that is behind them. . . . Dr. A. B. Davidson is a tower of strength, and he shows at his best in the articles on Angels, on Covenant (a masterpiece, full of illumination), and on Eschatology of the Old Testament. His contributions are the chief ornaments and treasure-stores of the Dictionary. . . . We are very conscious of having done most inadequate justice to this very valuable book. Perhaps, however, enough has been said to show our great sense of its worth. It is a book that one is sure to be turning to again and again with increased confidence and gratitude. It will be an evil omen for the Church if ministers do not come forward to make the best of the opportunity now presented them.'—*Editor, British Weekly*.

'Will give widespread satisfaction. Every person consulting it may rely upon its trustworthiness. . . . Far away in advance of any other Bible Dictionary that has ever been published in real usefulness for preachers, Bible students, and teachers.'—*Methodist Recorder*.

'This monumental work. It has made a great beginning, and promises to take rank as one of the most important biblical enterprises of the century.'—*Christian World*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

The
International Critical Commentary

on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and

New Testaments.

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

THE REV. SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.,
Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford;

THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.,
Late Master of University College, Durham;

AND

THE REV. CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D.,
*Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.*

The time has come, in the judgment of the projectors of this enterprise, when it is practicable to combine British and American scholars in the production of a critical, comprehensive Commentary that will be abreast of modern biblical scholarship, and in a measure lead its van. The Commentaries will be international and inter-confessional, and will be free from polemical and ecclesiastical bias. They will be based upon a thorough critical study of the original texts of the Bible, and upon critical methods of interpretation.

TWELVE VOLUMES OF THE SERIES ARE NOW READY.—See following pages.

'The publication of this series marks an epoch in English exegesis.'—*British Weekly*.

'We can sincerely congratulate the authors and the publishers upon producing one of the most epoch-making theological series of the day.'—*Church Bells*.

'The International Critical Commentary' promises to be one of the most successful enterprises of an enterprising age. . . . So far as it has gone it satisfies the highest expectations and requirements.'—*Bookman*.

'This series seems likely to surpass all previous enterprises of the kind in Great Britain and America.'—*Methodist Times*.

'The International Critical Commentary' has vindicated its claim to stand in the front rank of modern English exegesis. Every volume that has hitherto appeared has ranked with the foremost on the book expounded.'—*Methodist Recorder*.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON AGENTS.

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO. LTD.

To be had from all Booksellers.

[P.T.O.]

*

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

In post 8vo (pp. 540), price 12s.,

NUMBERS

BY

GEORGE BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A., D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN
MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

'Dr. Gray's commentary on Numbers will be indispensable to every English student.'—*Church Bells*.

In post 8vo, Third Edition (pp. 530), price 12s.,

DEUTERONOMY

BY

S. R. DRIVER, D.D.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.

Professor G. A. SMITH (in the *Critical Review*) says: 'The series could have had no better introduction than this volume from its Old Testament editor. . . . Dr. Driver has achieved a commentary of rare learning and still more rare candour and sobriety of judgment. . . . It is everywhere based on an independent study of the text and history. . . . it has a large number of new details: its treatment of the religious value of the book is beyond praise. We find, in short, all those virtues which are conspicuous in the author's previous works, with a warmer and more interesting style of expression.'

'There is plenty of room for such a comprehensive commentary as that which we are now promised, and if the subsequent volumes of the series come up to the standard of excellence set in the work that now lies before us, the series will supply a real want in our literature. . . . The Introduction is a masterly piece of work, and here the Oxford Professor of Hebrew is at his best. It gives by far the best and fairest discussion that we have ever seen of the critical problems connected with the book.'—*Guardian*.

'We have said enough, we hope, to send the student to this commentary. . . . To the diligent miner there is a wealth of gold and precious stones awaiting his toil and industry.'—*Church Bells*.

In post 8vo, Second Edition (pp. 526), price 12s.,

JUDGES

BY

GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MASS.

BISHOP H. E. RYLE, D.D., says: 'I think it may safely be averred that so full and scientific a commentary upon the text and subject-matter of the Book of Judges has never been produced in the English language.'

'Dr. Moore's "Judges" will come as a deep surprise to many in this country. It is not in any respect, so far as we have been able to judge, of lighter weight than the two great volumes of the series which appeared before it.'—*Expository Times*.

'It is unquestionably the best commentary that has hitherto been published on the Book of Judges.'—*London Quarterly Review*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

In post 8vo (pp. 460), price 12s.,

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

BY

HENRY P. SMITH, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION IN AMHERST COLLEGE.

'The commentary is the most complete and minute hitherto published by an English-speaking scholar.'—*Literature*.

'This latest volume of "The International Critical Commentary" is in nowise behind its predecessors in thoroughness and scholarship. We have only to compare it with any earlier English commentary on the same books to see how much our knowledge in every department of biblical scholarship has advanced during the past few years . . . The new light gained from Semitic folk-lore and the comparative study of Eastern customs and traditions is very welcome, and has been employed to illustrate the history, as also that coming from our modern geographical and archæological research.'—*Church Bells*.

In post 8vo (pp. 590), price 12s.,

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

BY

C. H. TOY, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

'The commentary is full, though scholarly and business-like, and must at once take its place as the authority on "Proverbs."'—*Bookman*.

'It is difficult to speak too highly of this volume. . . . The result is a first-rate book. It is rich in learning.'—*Jewish Chronicle*.

In post 8vo (pp. 600), price 12s.,

AMOS AND HOSEA

BY

PRESIDENT W. R. HARPER, PH.D.,

CHICAGO UNIVERSITY.

'Cannot fail to take its place as the English commentary that is indispensable to those who would understand the rise of written prophecy in Israel.'—Dr. SELBIE in the *Expository Times*.

'For thoroughness and excellence of workmanship, for clearness of arrangement and exposition, and for comprehensiveness and accuracy in the handling of textual, grammatical, and exegetical questions, this work should rank among the foremost.'—*Methodist Recorder*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

In post 8vo (pp. 375), price 10s. 6d.,

ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

By EZRA P. GOULD, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE,
DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

'This commentary is written with ability and judgment; it contains much valuable material, and it carries the reader satisfactorily through the Gospel. Great care has been spent upon the text.'—*Expositor*.

'Everything relating to the department of criticism on these points is more thoroughly explained and illustrated here than has ever been done before in an English commentary.'—*Methodist Times*.

In post 8vo, Fourth Edition (pp. 678), price 12s.,

ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

By ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.,

LATE MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM,
FORMERLY FELLOW AND SENIOR TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

'The best commentary on St. Luke yet published. Dr. Plummer's gifts for the work were already well known and appreciated, and he has not disappointed us in this his latest work.'—*Church Bells*.

'Marked by great learning and extreme common sense. . . . Altogether the book is far and away the best commentary on Luke we yet have in English.'—*Biblical World*.

'We feel heartily that the book will bring credit to English scholarship, and that in its carefulness, its sobriety of tone, its thoughtfulness, its reverence, it will contribute to a stronger faith in the essential trustworthiness of the gospel record.'—*Guardian*.

In post 8vo, Fifth Edition (pp. 562), price 12s.,

ROMANS

By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D.,

LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,

AND

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, B.D.,

FELLOW OF ALL SOULS' COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Principal F. H. CHASE, D.D., Cambridge, says: 'We welcome it as an epoch-making contribution to the study of St. Paul.'

'This is an excellent commentary, scholarly, clear, doctrinal, reverent, and learned. . . . It is a volume which will bring credit to English scholarship, and while it is the crown of much good work on the part of the elder editor, it gives promise of equally good work in the future from both.'—*Guardian*.

'A most valuable gift to the student of Romans. . . . It is the fullest and freshest in learning, the most patient, the most willing to be intelligible, and to make the Apostle so; and it need not be added, in any work of Dr. Sanday, that in textual criticism it will be a standard authority.'—*British Weekly*.

'It stands easily at the head of English commentaries. It has qualities, especially in what concerns the text, in which it is superior to the best works of Continental scholars.'—*Critical Review*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

In post 8vo (pp. 368), price 10s. 6d.,

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS

BY

T. K. ABBOTT, D.LIT.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, FORMERLY OF BIBLICAL GREEK, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

'There is no work in all the "International" series that is more faithful or more felicitous.'—*Expository Times*.

'All is done in a clear and easy style, and with a point and precision which will make his commentary one that the student will consult with satisfaction. . . . A strong book, with a certain marked individuality.'—*Critical Review*.

In post 8vo (pp. 240), price 8s. 6d.,

PHILIPPIANS AND PHILEMON

BY

MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

'It is in all respects such a commentary as is needed for the profitable study and right understanding of these two Epistles. . . . Dr. Vincent has produced a book which may be considered as summing up all that has been previously done for the elucidation of this Epistle of Paul and the shorter one which seems to have been written about the same time. . . . It is, in short, in every way worthy of the series which was so well commenced [in the New Testament] with Dr. Sanday's and Mr. Headlam's admirable commentary on the Romans.'—*Scotsman*.

'He has given us an addition of "Philippians" that takes its place beside its fellows in the very front rank of modern theological literature.'—*Expository Times*.

In post 8vo, Second Edition (pp. 369), price 10s. 6d.,

ST. PETER AND ST. JUDE

BY

CHARLES BIGG, D.D.,

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

'A first-rate critical edition of these Epistles has been for a long time a felt want in English theological literature . . . this has been at last supplied by the labours of Dr. Bigg. His notes are full of interest and suggestiveness.'—*Guardian*.

N.B.—For List of other Volumes in preparation, see page 8 of this Prospectus.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

XXIX.-XXX. *Moses' Third Discourse. Israel formally called upon to enter into the Deuteronomic Covenant.*

The Deuteronomic Code ends with c. 28. C. 29-30 is of the nature of a supplement, insisting afresh upon the fundamental principle of the Code, viz. devotion to Jehovah, and calling upon Israel to yield loyal allegiance to it. The discourse falls naturally into three parts. In the first, Moses, after referring to what Jehovah has done for Israel (29¹⁻⁸ (2-9)), reminds them that the purpose for which they are now assembled together is that they may enter solemnly into covenant with Him, and warns them afresh of the disastrous consequences, including national ruin and exile, which a lapse into idolatry will inevitably entail (29⁹⁻²⁸ (10-20)); in the second, imagining the threatened exile to have taken place, he promises that even then, if Israel sincerely repents, Jehovah will again receive it into His favour, and restore it to the land of promise (30¹⁻¹⁰); in the third, he sums up, in brief but forcible words, the two alternatives placed before Israel, life and happiness on the one side, death and misfortune on the other, and adjures the nation to choose wisely between them (30¹¹⁻²⁰).

In these chapters, the connection is sometimes imperfect, esp. between 30¹⁻¹⁰ and 30¹¹⁻²⁰ (see on 30¹¹); several words and phrases occur, not otherwise found in Dt. (Dillm. notes השביל 29⁸ (9), אלה oath, imprecation, 29^{11. 12. 13. 19. 20} (12. 14. 19. 20. 21) 30⁷, idol-blocks and detestations 29¹⁶ (17), שן 29¹⁷ (18), שררות stubbornness 29¹⁸ (19), אף, עין and סלה 29¹⁹ (20), לרעה unto evil 29²⁰ (21), מחלות sicknesses 29²¹ (22), forsake the covenant 29²⁴ (25), נחש pluck up 29²⁷ (28), הרה drive away 30^{1. 4}; and the phrases 29⁸ (9) b. 17 (18) b. 18 (19) b.); and the points of contact with Jeremiah are more numerous than usual. A question thus arises, whether the text is throughout in its original order, and whether it is entirely by the same hand as the body of Dt.: see the Introduction, § 4.

XXIX. 1-8 (2-9). Moses reminds the Israelites of all that Jehovah has wrought for them, from the time of their deliverance from Egypt, founding upon it a renewed exhortation to obey the words of the covenant.—The paragraph is a recapitulation of the substance of earlier parts of Dt., stated largely in the same phraseology.—1 (2). *And Moses called unto all Israel* (1¹), *and said unto them*] exactly as 5¹.—*Ye* (emph.) *have*

238 THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO S. LUKE [VIII. 54, 55.]

This laying hold of her hand and the raised voice (*ἐφώνησεν*) are consonant with waking one out of sleep, and the two may be regarded as the means of the miracle. Comp. and contrast throughout Acts ix. 36-42.

Ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε. "Arise, get up," not "awake." Mt. omits the command; Mk. gives the exact words, *Talitha cumi*. For the nom. with the art. as voc. see on x. 21, xviii. 11, 13. For *ἐφώνησεν* comp. ver. 8, xvi. 24.

55. ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς. There can be no doubt that the Evangelist uses the phrase of the spirit returning to a dead body, which is the accurate use of the phrase. Only the beloved physician makes this statement. In LXX it is twice used of a living man's strength reviving; of the fainting Samson (Judg. xv. 19), and of the starving Egyptian (1 Sam. xxx. 12). Note that Lk. has his favourite *παράχρημα*, where Mk. has his favourite *εὐθύς*; and comp. ver. 44, v. 25, xviii. 43, xxii. 60.

διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. This care of Jesus in commanding food after the child's long exhaustion would be of special interest to Lk. In their joy and excitement the parents might have forgotten it. The charge is somewhat parallel to *ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ* (vii. 15) of the widow's son at Nain. In each case He intimates that nature is to resume its usual course: the old ties and the old responsibilities are to begin again.

56. παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός. The command has been rejected as an unintelligible addition to the narrative. No such command was given at Nain or at Bethany. The object of it cannot have been to keep the miracle a secret. Many were outside expecting the funeral, and they would have to be told why no funeral was to take place. It can hardly have been Christ's intention in this way to prevent the multitude from making a bad use of the miracle. This command to the parents would not have attained such an object. It was given more probably for the parents' sake, to keep them from letting the effect of this great blessing evaporate in vainglorious gossip. To thank God for it at home would be far more profitable than talking about it abroad.

IX. 1-50. *To the Departure for Jerusalem.*

This is the last of the four sections into which the Ministry in Galilee (iv. 14-ix. 50) was divided. It contains the Mission of the Twelve (1-9), the Feeding of the Five Thousand (10-17), the Transfiguration (28-36), the Healing of the Demoniac Boy (37-43), and two Predictions of the Passion (18-27, 43-50).

1-9. The Mission of the Twelve and the Fears of Herod. Mt. x. 1-15; Mk. vi. 7-11. Mt. is the most full. Lk. gives no note

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY.

TWELVE VOLUMES NOW READY, viz. :—

Numbers (Dr. Gray), **Deuteronomy** (Dr. Driver), **Judges** (Dr. Moore), **I. and II. Samuel** (Dr. H. P. Smith), **Proverbs** (Dr. Toy), **Amos and Hosea** (Dr. Harper), **S. Mark** (Dr. Gould), **S. Luke** (Dr. Plummer), **Romans** (Dr. Sanday), **Ephesians and Colossians** (Dr. Abbott), **Philippians and Philemon** (Dr. Vincent), **S. Peter and S. Jude** (Dr. Biggs).

The following other Volumes are in course of preparation :—

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.	JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Westminster College, Cambridge.
Exodus.	A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, University of Edinburgh.
Leviticus.	J. F. STENNING, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford; and the late H. A. White, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford.
Joshua.	GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, United Free Church College, Glasgow.
Ruth.	C. P. FAGNANI, D.U., Associate Professor of Hebrew, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Kings.	FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., Litt.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Chronicles.	EDWARD L. CURTIS, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Ezra and Nehemiah.	L. W. BATTEN, D.D., late Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia.
Ezra.	L. B. PATON, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Hartford Theological Seminary.
Psalms.	CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., Professor of Theological Encyclopædics and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Ecclesiastes.	G. A. BARTON, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Bryn Mauer College, Pa., U.S.A.
Song of Songs and Lamentations.	C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Isaiah.	S. R. DRIVER, D.D., and G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Oxford.
Jeremiah.	A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge.
Ezekiel.	G. A. COCKE, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, and C. F. BURNBY, Litt.D., Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew, St. John's College, Oxford.
Daniel.	JOHN P. PETERS, D.D., late Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, now Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York.
Minor Prophets.	W. R. HARPER, LL.D., President of the University of Chicago.

[Amos and Hosea ready, 12s.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Synopsis of the Four Gospels.	W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and W. C. ALLEN, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
Matthew.	WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Chaplain, Fellow, and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford.
Acts.	C. H. TURNER, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford; and H. N. BATT, M.A., late Fellow and Dean of Divinity in Magdalen College, Oxford, now Vicar of St. Stephen's, Hampstead, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London.
Corinthians.	The Right Rev. ARCH. ROBERTSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter; and R. J. KNOWLING, D.D., Professor of Theology, Durham.
Galatians.	ERNEST D. BURTON, A.B., Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago.
Thessalonians.	JAMES E. FRAME, M.A., Professor of Biblical Theology Union, Theological Seminary, New York.
The Pastoral Epistles.	WALTER LOCK, D.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.
Hebrews.	A. NAIRNE, M.A., Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London.
James.	JAMES H. ROPES, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism in Harvard University.
The Johannine Epistles.	A. E. BROOKE, Fellow of, and Divinity Lecturer in King's College, Cambridge.
Revelation.	ROBERT H. CHARLES, D.D., Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin.

Other engagements will be announced shortly.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

Anderson - Howard

~~DUE~~ APR 25 1940

~~DUE~~ JUL 20 1940

~~MAY 5 '55~~

~~DEC 14 '60~~

DEC 4 1970

